BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL LIBRARY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

January, 1941

THE OLD TESTAMENT PROPHET IN HIS BACKGROUND	*I. G. Matthews*	3
TO END THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN SCHISM	*Conrad Henry Moehlman*	14
FREEDOM IN CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT	*William J. McGarry, S.J.*	23
SPEAKING OF CHALLENGES	*Henry C. Newell*	32
SOME FACTS ABOUT PALESTINE	*George Ricker Berry*	38
THEOLOGY IN THE LIGHT OF PSYCHIATRIC EXPERIENCE	*Anton T. Boisen*	47
FROM OFF THE CAMPUS AND ON		62
BOOK REVIEWS		65
BOOK NOTICES		78
BOOKS RECEIVED		83

Volume XVIII Number 1

330350

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Published by
Crozer Theological Seminary
Chester, Pennsylvania

MORTON S. ENSLIN, Editor
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, Business Manager

The policy of the CROZER QUARTERLY is to present investigations, discussions, and reviews in the field of religion which will prove of value and interest to the professional student of religion and to the layman.

Manuscripts, books for review, and communications for the editor should be addressed
Editor of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania
Business communications and subscriptions should be addressed
Business Manager of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania

Issued Quarterly $1.50 a year Single Numbers, 40 cents

Printed for the Crozer Theological Seminary by
THE JUDSON PRESS
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, January, 1941, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Vol. XVIII JANUARY, 1941 No. 1

THE OLD TESTAMENT PROPHET IN HIS BACKGROUND[1]

I. G. MATTHEWS

Crozer Theological Seminary

IN THE Jewish Scriptures the law occupies the place of first importance, while the prophets are considered of secondary value. But during recent centuries the sacred law has been subjected to critical study, and its origin and high quality have been seriously tested. Research in the fields of anthropology and sociology has produced evidence that law is as old as the human family. Every tribe on the face of the earth has been compelled by the very nature of its existence to develop laws, written or unwritten, and these always in due time have attained divine sanctions. There is no law in the Old Testament without its counterpart among some or many of the neighboring peoples. Millennia before Israel came into existence, great empires had civil codes and religious ritual more elaborate than anything the Hebrews ever knew. Hence assertions as to the uniqueness of Jewish law are but idle words. Every student is aware that law is always the product of tribal and national history, and the vaunted superiority of Old Testament law is akin to modern claims for the superiority of the Aryan race. This conclusion does not render the law less valuable, but it removes it from the realm of the supernatural and brings it, like the Code of Hammurabi or the Napoleonic Code, down to earth as the product of human intelligence. It makes it understandable, and at the same time puts a limit to priestly interpretation.

Prophecy, which had a similar background and often suffered from the same well-intentioned claims, has been undergoing a parallel enfranchisement. Here again criticism has been at work, sifting old theories, testing values, and thereby providing firm foundations.

To the thoughtful student it has long been apparent that prophecy was always a message from a living man to living men of his own generation, dealing with ethical and religious issues of their own day. That prophecy was chiefly prediction—a concept once prevalent—has no adequate support in the prophets themselves. The worthlessness of a theory

[1] Matriculation address, Sept. 30, 1940.

that considers any part of Scripture a pre-view of history is self-evident. The innumerable conflicting programs that have been worked out on this basis proclaim it futile, even if it were not fundamentally irreligious.

All Scripture is historically conditioned. If this be true, then for the understanding of prophecy a knowledge of the background of each prophet is essential.

It is a commonplace that these men belonged to a different race, lived in a different age, and enjoyed a vastly different culture from ours. They were Oriental, we are Western. They had much Semitic blood, we are largely Aryan. They lived in a simple, non-mechanized civilization, we are in a mechanized civilization with its robot mass production. They had a rich cultural heritage, all of which was pre-scientific, and much of which belonged to the desert; we boast of the widening horizons of the telescope and the amazing revelations of the test tube. To understand these ancient writers, to appreciate their accents, and to interpret justly is no easy task. We must needs listen to them in their ancient language, be familiar with their customs, and be appreciative of their thought-world.

To know the social and economic features of Hebrew life should be our first consideration. However, these are so vast and so varied and so foreign to our own that adequate treatment would require a volume. Space and time permit only a general conclusion with a few cogent illustrations.

Meaningful as were the messages of the prophets to their contemporaries, it is perilous to attempt to transplant any of their cultural background into our present-day life. The general principles of justice and good will are ever valid, but the application of them is ever in a state of flux. To follow ancient injunctions literally would often result in honoring a custom of antiquity at the expense of a vital principle. To illustrate: interest on money, condemned of old, under some circumstances might be the essence of justice and good will. Private ownership of suburban areas, cursed by Isaiah,[2] in a different economic situation might be praiseworthy. Winter-houses and summer-houses, and costly interior decorations so savagely assailed by Amos[3] may some day be accepted by religious leaders as the desired goal for every family. To limit a Sabbath-day's journey[4] in ancient Palestine to a mile may have been a worth-while experiment then, but today it would be folly. Thus while a few principles may gain in authority with the passing of the centuries, many of the specific injunctions of the Hebrews are to us of no more value than are the arrow points

[2] Isa. 5: 8.
[3] Amos 3: 15.
[4] Exod. 16: 29; Acts 1: 12.

of the Old Stone Age. To try to make them regulative for our civilization would be as futile as to ask the modern woman to fashion her coiffure according to the injunctions of the Apostle Paul. To torture these ancient writings so that they may yield some doctrine for today is to darken history and corrupt our own mental integrity. Most specific regulations which belong to the background of prophecy are more honored in the breach than in the observance.

Along side of this socio-economic background of prophecy, indeed penetrating it, lay the world view of the ancient East. This, their mythology if you wish, was the thought-mold in which popular Palestinian religion lived and moved and had its being. It was the atmosphere in which the prophet lived and from childhood up it formed the substratum of his thought and his religion. It was the product of the intermingling of the theories of the world order of many peoples—Horites and Hittites, Egyptians and Babylonians, Canaanites and Phœnicians—constantly fertilized by the Arabians from the desert. Primitive, we call it, but it was the result of profound pondering of vast experience, and was an aid to living. In order to do the prophets justice we must be familiar with the leading features in this, their theological background.

This world view we now present in the most general terms. The central idea in it may be stated as follows: The physical world, as a whole and in each and every part, was inhabited by spirits, who controlled or influenced it for weal or woe according to their disposition and ability. This spirit world, with spirits innumerable, invisible, with activities and powers but vaguely understood, was thought of as loosely organized on the model of ancient society. Human experience in government, of necessity, provided the pattern on which this hierarchy of spirits was conceived.

To be specific, spirits were believed to inhabit such objects as trees, springs, and stones.[5] Jacob in his vision at Bethel believed he had good evidence of this.[6] These spirits frequented desert places, caves, and mountain tops, where they were heard and sometimes seen by favored individuals.[7] They might find their way into pots and pans with disastrous results; hence such vessels should be covered.[8] The major spirits were deemed the responsible agents for earthquakes and storms, for drought and plagues.[9] Altars were sometimes erected that the savor of burning

[5] Gen. 12: 6; 14: 7; Exod. 20: 25; Josh. 24: 26.
[6] Gen. 28: 11-18.
[7] Gen. 16: 14; Exod. 3: 2; 19: 3; I Kings 19: 5.
[8] Numb. 18: 3; 19: 15.
[9] Exod. 8: 5-7, 17, 24; 12: 29.

flesh might stay the spirit of the pestilence;[10] sometimes human sacrifice was offered to appease the angered spirit of drought.[11]

On occasion a spirit might enter an animal, domestic or wild, and in obscure affairs of critical import give council as to the will of God. Balaam's ass[12] and the she-camel of Mohammed are cases in point out of a rich tradition. All mental diseases, the melancholia of Saul,[13] the ecstasies of the sons of the prophets,[14] epilepsy, illusion, bad temper, in fact all psychic abnormalties in general were attributed to the activities of these spirits. Even the abnormal child was often considered the offspring of a mother who had had intercourse with one of these spirits.[15]

One phase of this spirit-possession that is peculiarly pertinent to our discussion was their idea of inspiration. As all mental disturbances and all peculiarities of expression were attributed to spirit activity, so many of the utterances of such people were considered the messages of spirits. Phrases that were ambiguous or hard to understand, especially if spoken under great strain, physical or mental, all oracles, execrations, and blessings were readily ascribed to the operation of supernatural beings.

Owing to this, many phrases, such as "oracle of Yahweh," "thus saith Yahweh," that originated in the lower strata of primitive religion, abound in the later periods of Old Testament history. They were freely used by all classes for apologetic purposes. The priest who wished to validate an old practice felt justified in appealing to the word of Yahweh, while his opponent used the same slogan to defend the new. One prophet, in the name of Yahweh proclaimed "peace, peace," while the burden of his neighbor's message in the name of the same deity was "woe to the bloody city." True and false alike used the same formulæ and claimed the same divine authority. To the hearers these were but the conventional phrases of religious propaganda, the indications, probably, of the firm conviction of the speaker. Hence all such formulæ in themselves prove nothing as to inherent value or inspiration; they are of little more value than quotation marks.

That this conclusion is irrefutable is seen when we widen the horizon of study. Here we find these phrases were current in all lands and were on the lips of all leaders. Sargon of Accad, Hammurabi of Babylonia, Mesha of Moab, Akhenaton of Egypt, Nebuchadnezzar, builder of the hanging gardens of Babylonia, Cyrus of Persia, and practically every

[10] II Sam. 24: 18-25.
[11] II Sam. 21: 1-8.
[12] Numb. 22: 22-30.
[13] I Sam. 16: 15; 18: 10; 19: 9.
[14] I Sam. 10: 5, 10; 19: 18-24.
[15] Gen. 6: 4.

other important ruler in ancient history claimed, for every important act or law, that his work was done at the behest of his god. Nor does modern America with its John Smith and Father Divine lag behind antiquity in its appeal to fictitious phraseology. To throw up such a smoke screen for the defence of a supernatural origin of prophecy would seem to be the last refuge of decadent religion, the defence mechanism of a lost cause. To be inspired a message must inspire. No hackneyed phrases from mythology can detract from or add to it.

This world view, so strange to us, was desperately real to the Hebrews. It had been born out of human experience and fashioned after human analogy. The scientist in man was only stirring in his slumber. He concluded that behind all phenomena were the anima or spirits, invisible but effective agents in the world of human affairs. To thwart the hostile powers and to cultivate an alliance with those that were friendly was for man a life and death necessity. The medicine man, or, as we might call him, the primitive priest, came on the scene. His task was to placate some of the spirits and to win the favor of others. His method was experimental. He acted toward the spirits as he would have acted with men. He made friendly signs, gave gifts, provided food and drink, and offered sacrifices. He found methods that seemed to be approved. Thus arose a body of religious ritual that in due time became the *sine qua non* of orthodoxy. Magic was the ruling principle underlying this corpus of approved rites and ceremonies.

One dominant element, fertility worship, because of the seductive role it played in the popular religion, deserves special notice. This worship, as indicated in the term itself, "fertility worship," or "nature worship," was directly related to reproduction, and boasts of an origin as old as that of the human family. Long before the eighth century B.C., the Hebrews had become food producers. Their livelihood, therefore, depended on the powers of reproduction. The fruitfulness of the sheep and the cattle, the germination and the maturity of the grain, and the increase of the family were basic to national existence. To this end the deities of fertility were worshiped in those ways that had won popular approval. The general characteristics of such worship, which was almost universal, were simple. As the underlying principle in magic was that like produces like, so throughout the land springtime festivals were observed in which fertility was encouraged by ritual acts believed to stimulate the reproductivity of flock and field and family. Needless to say, such festivals degenerated into orgies, and in the name of religion were prolific of immorality.

The background of Old Testament thought may thus be summarized.

The customs—social, economic, and political—were Oriental and altogether foreign to us. The mythology, or world thought, held that every natural object was the abode of a spirit, and that spirits innumerable were the active agents in all the mysterious forces that played upon man. Magic, understood chiefly by the priesthood, was the method by which the activities of these spirits were controlled. Fertility worship was an essential part of popular religion. It was crude, sensuous, superstitious, magical.

Toward this background the attitude of the prophets, while naturally varying with individuals and periods, may be said to be twofold. Much of the current mythology was accepted as a matter of course. It was the thought pattern in which they were born, and was as surely their medium of expression as were the vocabulary and syntax of the Hebrew language.

Naturally they thought the earth was flat, supported on pillars, and that the heaven was a solid canopy bending over it. That the sun and the moon rose, set, and revolved around the earth was the testimony of their senses and the teaching of their scholars. That disease and drought, famine and hurricane were due to the activities of spirits seems never to have been questioned. That ecstasy and strong private convictions were the results of extra-personal forces had been the accepted psychology for a thousand years. Why should they question it? In large part, without question they accepted the wisdom of the ancients; so far the prophets were orthodox.

This orthodoxy made them understandable to their own generation. But we delight in them because of their heresies. If they accepted part of the world view of the day, they violently rejected other most significant parts.

On one great truth—then a great heresy—the prophets all agreed, *viz.*, that the supreme interest of Israel's God was justice, the right economic relation of man to man. This was both a theological and an economic heresy. That the eternal God, the creator of this universe, should be interested in the petty affairs of human life—the kind of weights the grocer used, the quality of wheat sold by the merchant, the wages paid the slave, the interest paid on a loan, the kind of bed on which the pauper slept, the jewelry worn by the women, and the amount of wine drunk at banquets—all such commonplaces seemed too insignificant to merit the attention of Deity.

Such mundane affairs, the prophets insisted, were the first and chief demand of the God of Israel. To them, good works took precedence over all the prevalent requirements of the national religious leaders. To do

justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God is the prophetic summation of the requirements of Deity.[16]

The reasoning that led to this conclusion is clear. Amos, who no doubt had precursors, disclaimed all relationship with the school of the prophets.[17] He was not an ecstatic on whom the spirit of God swooped down, "changing him into another man." He was a layman, who had eyes to see, a heart to feel, and a mind to reason. He saw the prevailing suffering of the poor, the widow, and the orphan; the shocking injustice of the market place; big business greedy for profits; judges selling out for a mess of pottage; religious leaders busy with incense pots and sacred formulæ. Hot indignation in the cause of humanity welled up within him. External credentials of inspiration he had none. But he was a human being, with human sympathies, with normal intelligence. He reasoned from his own sense of justice that surely God was as humane and as just as he, a layman, was in his best moments. Priests, prophets, and king could not silence him. These flagrant injustices to humanity could not be other than an abomination to the eternal Spirit of justice, of truth, and of goodness. Micah the country boy, Hosea the farmer from the North, Jeremiah the disinherited priest, and others are in full agreement with this reasoning and with these conclusions. These laymen, freed from the blight of ecclesiasticism, were convinced that the prevailing economic system, which had the sanction of religion, was inhuman and unjust, and, as it was so to men, axiomatically it must be so to God. Goodness and mercy and justice needed no fictitious defence. In their own right, the expression of human needs and aspirations, they stood before the tribunal of the ages as self-validating. The voices of the human heart, the world over, proclaim these virtues as divine. Hence it goes almost without saying that the God whom the prophets worshiped was a God preëminently righteous.

Further, as a corollary of the idea that God was righteous, is the repudiation of the ritual of the nation. All with one accord—Amos,[18] Hosea,[19] Micah,[20] Isaiah,[21] Jeremiah[22]—insist that all the rites and ceremonies of the day were an abomination to Yahweh. Interpreters often endeavor to take the sting out of these classic passages. But those who first heard them uttered, the priests and the court prophets, were unaware that they were half-hearted exaggerations of the fact. Nor does the

[16] Mic. 6: 8.
[17] Amos 7: 13.
[18] Amos 5: 23-27.
[19] Hos. 6: 6.
[20] Mic. 6: 6-8.
[21] Isa. 1: 11-17.
[22] Jer. 6: 20; 7: 21-23.

modern reader, who has no apologetic axe to grind, find in them any support for ritual. Jars of oil, blood streaming from altars, the odor of incense, and the sacrifice of the first born—that all these lie not within the ancient requirements of an ethical God is the united claim of the prophets.

One phase of the ancient cultus, Baalism, against which the prophets set their faces like flint, has been characterized. This Baalism, or fertility worship, centred on productivity; hence it opened the doors to social vice. In wide-sweeping, oft-reiterated phrases the prophets denounced it so vigorously that not all the most honored sanctions of religion could protect it. The goddess, Mother Goddess, or Madonna, if you will, found so universally in all religions as the partner of the male deity, because of the attitude of these prophets had to go. Indeed, it is an astonishing fact that, owing to the fierce denunciation of these humble men, not only was chastity enthroned in Israelitish ethics but the goddess of fertility never again dared show her face in orthodox Judaism, and only rarely and in a modified form has she ever appeared in Christianity.

We, today, worship God as a male being, and call him master, lord, and father, but we rebel against the term mother. This is one of the unique features of our theological inheritance. How this happened is an interesting question. The answer lies in no single direction, but a few suggestions lie on the surface.

That Judaism was patriarchal, and hence that the sheikh, or lord, was the ruler is quite apparent. Throughout all the Old Testament the man counted, the woman played a secondary role. As it was in the tents of Israel, so must it be in the courts of heaven, was the logic.

Beyond that, Israel's religion was largely desert-born. Here for ten thousand years a slip in sex-morality called for death. There was no appeal. In fact, chastity everywhere is the ideal, even of the unchaste. Hence, even the cloak of religion could not long shield the prevalent immoralities that were germane to the fertility cult.

In addition to these influences, it is probable that Hosea played a large part in this movement. His wife, who may earlier have been a devotee of this Canaanitish cult, after the birth of three children left him for a paramour. But Hosea could not forget her and finally brought her back. From this tragic personal experience he came to believe that the relation between Yahweh and Israel was somewhat similar to that between himself and his wife. God was the husband, Israel was the bride. Israel, in following the gods of fertility, committed adultery or apostasy. But surely Yahweh was as kindly and as forgiving as was Hosea himself. Thus a domestic tragedy aided in the birth of a great conviction, *viz.*,

that God was kindly and loving. Humble in its origin, it is logical and self-evident. God is as good as man at his best.

On the whole then the basis of prophetic reaction against the evils of the day is quite clear. Amos and Micah were certain that it was wrong to cheat, to steal, to lie, and to treat human beings inhumanly. Hosea knew that he loved an erring woman, and was confident that Yahweh was as forgiving as he. Isaiah was convinced that the Lord was high and lifted up and was better than man at his best. Jeremiah, Habbakuk, and Job learned through the trial and error method that only the law written in the heart and the satisfactions of the inner life were enduring and trustworthy. Ezekiel and his school, amid the ruins of Jerusalem, concluded that brute force was sub-human while righteousness was preëminently human, and therefore that right was more enduring than might.

So runs the story of religious progress. Prophecy came of old through men of like passions and like mental processes as ourselves. Their experiences were basically normal. They arrived at their conclusions in much the same way as does the scientist. As the biologist or the chemist, by observing processes and reactions, concludes that some are helpful while others are injurious to certain organisms, so the prophet, living in and observing the social, economic, and religious order, judged some conduct to be wrong and other acts to be right. In prophecy, as in law, we find no incommunicable truth, received in trance or in ecstasy by men who had become automata. This weird theory, the product of a priesthood that considered magic to be central in religion, is never found in the great prophets of the Old Testament. These men, to the best of their ability, thought their way through the pressing problems of their generation, and believed that in doing so they were in accord with the mind of the God of humanity.

Let us conclude with a brief résumé. The background of prophecy was primitive, Semitic mythology, an altogether pre-scientific view of the world order. Naturally, this was accepted by the prophets, as were their garments and their language. But almost every phase of this ancient culture is quite irrelevant and is often incomprehensible to our age. Their ideas of man, physically and mentally, are outmoded as definitely as are the geology and astrology of the Hebrews. That diseases are the work of malevolent spirits, that astrology is a science by which human destiny can be read, that animals, on occasion, can counsel man in his own speech, or that at times the eternal First Cause flashes a message to some favored acolyte—all such belong to the realm of mythology. Such conclusions were the laudable efforts of early man to explain the forces around him

and within him. They had profound significance to early generations. But they were the ABC of human knowledge, the first faltering steps toward light and truth. But to stop here or to capitalize that early lore as divine and hence infallible is to accept the kindergarten as humanity's goal, while on every side the horizons of life are ever enlarging.

But the glory of the prophets is their twofold challenge to the thinking of their day. They were pioneers in social and ethical reform. In the face of vested interests they insisted that justice and kindness, axiomatically, were the rights of man. Hence they must, of necessity, be the demands of Deity.

In this machine age, when so oft men are considered chattels, and when the might of Empire so relentlessly crushes the life out of man, the successors of the prophets are demanding for all men liberty, equality, and fraternity. These, the inalienable rights of man, call for no supernatural revelation. In this field, are we, or are the workers in science and the leaders of labor, those who wear the prophetic mantle?

More heroically still, the prophet challenged the orthodoxy of his generation, and insisted that, as God was a God of character, he had no interest in smoking altars, and abominated the central features of their religious practices, because in the very nature of things they ministered to human lust and to religious apostasy. Thus they purified religion and paved the way for worship in spirit and in truth.

Again, in these days, when such feverish efforts are being made to rehabilitate a decadent ritual, and when such laudable hopes are expressed as to the saving values of worship, do we keep step with the prophets of old, or do we follow in the pathway of the priest? It was laymen from the outlying villages who in the ancient days saw clearly the dangers of the ecclesiastical tradition.

Still more important is the fact that the prophet trusted his own judgment rather than the dictates of a hierarchy which claimed to possess a supernatural revelation. In his inmost conscience, he knew certain things were right, and from this he concluded that these same things must be right in the eyes of the God of all mankind. He taught not from above down, but from the within to the without; he worked from the known to the unknown.

With his contemporaries, he probably never questioned the existence of spirits in stones, trees, and springs, in wind and wave, in sun and moon and star; but to him God was preëminently in man. In human phantasy, probably; in human emotion, which was the upsurge of tribal custom, certainly; but most positively in human reason, man's chief distinction. The prophet was ever alert to the stirrings within the depths of human

consciousness, which are ever striving toward broader horizons and loftier human ideals. An old proverb well expresses their attitude:

> The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord,
> Searching all the inward parts.[23]

It was with the spirit of man that they started. From the known, they felt their way toward the unknown, the candle of the Lord. An early Christian theologian expresses much the same fact from a different angle, when he says,

> The true light was that which illumines every man who cometh into the world.[24]

When the aspirants for religious leadership today learn with the prophets to listen to the deep musings of human aspiration and to trust and exercise their intelligence, the supreme gift of the ages to humanity, then the voice of God will be heard throughout the land, and a new day will dawn in the kingdom of righteousness and good will among men.

[23] Prov. 20: 27.

[24] John 1: 6 (Weymouth).

TO END THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN SCHISM

CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN
Colgate-Rochester Divinity School

On page 312 of *What Is Christianity?* by Charles Clayton Morrison, the reader comes upon this statement: "Opinionativeness, contentiousness, and egotism are not Christian virtues, nor do they go with the freedom that is in Christ. They go rather with anarchy, disintegration, and chaos."

Yet in the chapter on "The Heresy of Protestantism" one reads about an omitted chapter upon "The Roman Catholic Apostasy," which would have been devoted to stating that this church transferred "divine grace from the vital processes of the concrete historical community to the legalistic control of an autonomous hierarchy," thereby making Rome "guilty of schism. . . . And it is the great apostasy. In the light of it, the claim of the Roman Church to be one, holy, catholic and apostolic is unwarranted, for not one of these characteristics does she possess" (pp. 198 f., 253).

Protestantism in general and the various denominations in particular will not exactly rejoice over the findings of the author regarding them. "Protestant theory is more akin to Buddhism than to Christianity" (p. 209); "Protestantism is Gnosticism" (p. 219); "the Christ of Protestantism is an apparition. Luther succeeded where Marcion failed" (p. 220); "the Christian church is a society of sinners" (p. 211); "for a part of the church to ordain ministers for itself and by itself is essentially a schismatic action" (p. 292); "neither can Anglicanism ask the Protestant ministry to accept reordination" (p. 299); "inevitably, this ultra-sectarian practice becomes the subject of impatient and, sometimes, even cynical comment by other Christians" (p. 294).

Democratic Christianity seems especially offensive to the author of *What Is Christianity?:*

> And congregationalism is the ultimate sectarianism . . . it is unwilling to recognize even its own denomination as a "church" . . . to them [Baptists, Disciples, Congregationalists] the New Testament offers no pattern of church organization except that of the local church. . . . This, I say, is the *ne plus ultra* of sectarianism. . . . In congregationalism, the church exists in the cell, not in the organism (p. 240).

> And the rebaptism of a non-Baptist Christian is neither illogical nor need it carry invidious implications. The fact that Baptists are received into other churches without rebaptism is no part of Baptist intention, but is an illogical expression of the Christian spirit of the other churches.

For them [the Disciples] to practice rebaptism is therefore both illogical and unchristian (p. 289).

The acceptance of a baptized Methodist into a Presbyterian church without rebaptism is a wholly illogical . . . procedure (p. 288).

Both Catholicism and Protestantism will be amazed to discover that the eucharist is nowhere truly celebrated:

It remains to be said . . . that the true celebration of this sacrament [the eucharist] must wait until our schismatic bodies consent to restore to the whole body of Christ that integral responsibility for its celebration which our schismatic bodies have usurped. Only thus can the unity of the body be declared wherever and whenever the Table is spread (p. 309).

For our author, then, all the Christian bodies seem to be sects. The proposed definition of sect is unique: "A sect is a part of the body of Christ which exercises by itself and for itself those functions which belong to the unity of the whole body" (p. 280). The difficulty with this definition is that not one of the over two hundred fifty religious groups in the United States would accept it, and history knows naught of it. From Roman Catholicism down to Plymouth Brethren VIII and Two Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists, from groups of twenty million to groups of ninety-two, each and every Christian church has always insisted that it is one and only. It never acts by itself and for itself. It acts *in his name* and for the interest of the kingdom of God. The Six Principle Baptists have continued from the seventeenth century to the twentieth century because they believe themselves to be *the Church of God.* A "sect" would not continue a month which did not regard itself as a universal church. A "sect" is the entire body of Christ and is always acting for the whole body of Christ. When our author (p. 241) quotes Matt. 18:20, which actually reads: "For where two or three are gathered together *in my name,* there am I in the midst of them," with *in my name* omitted, he misses the point! But why did he omit the essential words?

A few instances betraying unfamiliarity with facts or ignorance of recent historical discovery should now be cited. "Blinded in the noonday sun and stricken *from his horse,* Paul heard a Voice speaking to him." A search of Acts 9, 22, 26 failed to locate the horse. Paul abandoned the expectation of a return of the Lord from the right hand of God and this in spite of the Apostles' Creed which must be accepted! But I Cor. 15:51 f. reads: "Here is a secret truth for you: not all of us are to die. . . . The trumpet will sound, the dead will rise imperishable, and we [Paul and the first generation of Christians] shall be transformed."

Baptism, we are told, is the act of admitting new members. Which kind of baptism—water baptism or baptism by the Spirit? Which church either ordered the baptism of the eunuch or received him into its membership (Acts 8:38)? Which church ordered the baptism of the jailer at Philippi (Acts 16:33) or of the Samaritans (Acts 8:12)? Baptism in the early church is an exceedingly complicated problem with many aspects of which *What Is Christianity?* does not seem to be acquainted. Its assumptions regarding Gnosticism are also somewhat out of date. For Harnack, Gnosticism was the "acute hellenization of Christianity." But this interpretation was being set aside as early as 1907 and today Gnosticism has become "*pre-Christian* oriental mysticism" and a way of salvation. Many church historians have long since abandoned the theory that Luther and his followers were revolutionary in their attitude toward Catholicism. The Augsburg Confession was an attempt to demonstrate that the reformers were Catholics largely in agreement with the Catholic doctrine and dissenting only at certain specified points. With all modern Protestant churches endorsing Catholic dogma in so many articles of their confessions and many of them bound by the ecumenical creeds, one wonders about the accuracy of "declaring Rome to be anti-Christ, the reformers were driven to adopt the strategy of presenting Christianity *as a totally different conception* from that which Rome exemplifies" (p. 202). Later Protestant anti-Roman trends may not in fairness be antedated. The author really ought to discriminate between Lutheranism, Anabaptism, Calvinism, Anglicanism, democratic Christianity in the first century of Protestantism, and after that between earlier Protestantism and contemporary Protestantism to present the historical picture of innumerable complications. A patchwork quilt and a blue spread are just a bit different.

Is there a more intricate problem for the New Testament scholar than that of ascertaining what kingdom of God meant back there? Our author knows all about this too:

> But the Kingdom which Jesus saw was not something to be "restored" by a catastrophic crushing of Israel's oppressors and the establishing of Israel's political preëminence. It was not something to be looked for as an apocalyptic event. God's kingdom of Israel is now here, he declared; it is "among you"; it has "come upon you" (p. 112).

> Like his contemporaries, Jesus too looked toward an impending catastrophe. But the catastrophe which he envisaged was not the violent crushing of Israel's oppressors, but the crushing of Israel itself. This was the dominant feature of his eschatological outlook. With him the Kingdom of God was not an eschatological concept, but the immanent reality of Israel's existence, to which Israel's eyes "are blind, etc." (p. 114).

The remedy for this dogmatism is a thoroughgoing course in Weiss, Bousset, Dibelius, *und wie sie alle heissen.*

The author's conception of the eucharist seems to be derived from the Fourth Gospel. The newer research is again ignored. When the New Testament scholar has at last become able to trace the story of the eucharist from its simple beginnings in the Jerusalem church to its additions from Paul, Synoptic gospels, and Johannine literature, must not even the coming "united church" take these conclusions into consideration? But if the late Johannine point of view holds here, why is the church called a "society of sinners" in spite of John 3:3, "Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God"; John 17:9, "I pray for those whom thou has given me"; I John, 5:19, "We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness"; and I John 4:4-6, "My dear children, you belong to God . . . They belong to the world; therefore they speak as inspired by the world, and the world listens to them. We belong to God: he who knows God listens to us; he who does not belong to God does not listen to us"? The early church summoned sinners to repentance and forgiveness and thereupon to membership. That was Origen's reply to Celsus. That the early church was a society of saved sinners would better correspond to the ancient Christian theology.

The thesis of this study as formulated on page 66 is:

> As I see it, the Christian church is the revelation of God in history. By the Christian church, I mean that particular human community whose historical continuum extends as far back as the beginnings of the Hebrew people, a community which first emerged in history as an exclusive racial community, which passed, in the immediate presence of Jesus of Nazareth and by virtue of his life and work, into a community of the remnant of Israel, and which finally became the superracial and inclusive community which we know specifically as the Christian church. Together these constitute one unbroken stream of historical human community. They may be bound together in our thought as such a unitary stream by entitling their successive stages as (1) the Christian Church Before Christ, (2) the Church of the Remnant and (3) the Church which is the Body of Christ. It is this particular ongoing stream of human community which is the revelation, in history, of the presence, the character and the purpose of God. This continuing community *is* Christianity, or if you prefer, Christianity *is* this particular continuing community (p. 66).

Similarly, Swedenborg discovered a succession of churches: Adamic, Noachic, Israelitish, Christian, and New. Shakerism has its Abrahamic church, Mosaic church, I Pentecostal, and II Pentecostal churches. Jehovah's Witnesses believe in the World That Was, the World That Is, and the World That Is to Be in which dwelleth righteousness. Dispen-

sationalism is a *deus ex machina* used by too many Protestant groups to trace their history, and the despair of the historian. For when allegorization and symbolism are once resorted to, arbitrariness mounts the throne.

Christianity's relation to Judaism has been debated since Pentecost. The earliest Christians believed Christianity to be a modified Judaism. To become a Christian one must first become a Jew. The law was in force for gentile as well as Jewish Christians. One compromise was that the law remained in force for Jewish Christians who belonged to the "way" and the congregation but not for the gentile Christian who belonged only to the "way." Paul thought the law abrogated for all as far as salvation was concerned. The way to God is the way of faith. The *Epistle of Barnabas* taught that the ceremonial law was never meant literally and that the Jews never were the chosen. Thereupon the traditional hypothesis of Christianity's relation to Judaism, to which our author's theory bears such striking resemblance, was born. It held that during the centuries of silence between the close of the Old Testament period and the beginning of the New Testament period the Jews became blind to prophecy and changed the law into legalism. Jesus went back to the Old Testament and by fulfilling messianic prophecy connected the true ancient people of God with the new people of God. Christianity is the continuation of the truly spiritual and ethical elements of the Old Testament. The real truth of the Old Testament is discoverable by the allegorical method. The Jewish people had the prerogative but they cast off their Messiah and are now cast off by God. The privileges of the Jews were transferred to the new true Israel, namely, the gentile Christians. It was Paul who rubbed out Israel's actual connection with its own past and appropriated that history for Christianity. This is easily the most colossal appropriation in the history of humanity. What had been Jewish history was by the use of a bit of ancient ink made over into Christian history. It was rather violent procedure thus to antedate Christian history by centuries and centuries. Christian history became fictitious when it was made to include everything between Abraham and Jesus. The church actually originated after the death of Jesus, but in this ideology the church began with Abraham. Soon its origin was pushed back to the creation of the world. Paul boldly blotted out Israel's past but nevertheless believed that any Jew embracing Christianity would have certain advantages over the gentile Christian.

It was Augustine who took the decisive step when in his *De Civitate Dei* he reconstructed the history of the world from the point of view of the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God was now traced back to Abel,

continued in Israel, preserved by the church. *History ceased to have to do with peoples and nations and became a history of ideas.* It ceased to be factual and became mythological. The history of Israel did not concern Israel, which had fashioned that history, but an institution, the Christian church, which had nothing to do with it.

This devastating dogmatic philosophy of history, then, was adopted by the various peoples of Europe which embraced the Christian faith. And this scheme of history was accepted by the Protestant denominations when they originated in the sixteenth century. Hence the Baptists, because they believed in immersion, regarded themselves as beginning with John the Baptizer who practiced immersion in Jordan about 28 A.D. Medieval culture was the Christian epic. God enthroned high above the world governs that world through the church. The church and humanity date from the creation of the world. Then they were Israel. Israel was replaced by or became the church. Pagan nations evangelized by the medieval church abandoned their own mythology for a new one offered by the church, namely, a mythologized Israel. Israel, an actual people in primitive times, was now a mythical people from whom Christian Europe derived its spiritual blessings.

And this Christian philosophy of history did not begin to disintegrate until the seventeenth century and reigns supreme in many Christian circles today.

After becoming historically minded in the twentieth century, is the church to return to medieval allegorization and symbolism? If so, let it recall what that would mean. Two illustrations must suffice. Augustine approached the 153 fishes of John 21:11 and said: Fishes! Of course not! Let's discover the deeper meaning. Add 1 plus 2 plus 3 up to and including 17 and the total is 153. Now 17 equals 10 plus 7. You would still seem to have ten little fishes in this pile and seven little fishes in that pile. But Augustine dogmatically said you *really* had the ten commandments in the "ten" and the Holy Spirit in the "seven." No one in the ancient church could discover from the gospels when Jesus was born. But a bright Christian discovered that Exod. 25:10 read: "Thou shalt make the length of the ark 2½ cubits; the breadth, 1½ cubits; and the height, 1½ cubits." But 2½ plus 1½ plus 1½ yield 5½. Let 1,000 years equal one cubit. Then 5½ cubits equals 5,500 years. Whence Jesus was born *Anno Mundi* 5500 and the millennium will begin in 500 A.D., since in 6 days [*i. e.,* 6,000 years] God made heaven and earth! The Sabbath day or millennium must immediately follow.

Instead of examining the author's thesis point by point, we think it will be a much more constructive method to summarize the findings

of New Testament scholarship regarding the origin and early history of the Christian church and thus enable the reader to draw his own conclusions. To prevent any accusation of prejudice, we employ a study of the subject by Professor Burton Scott Easton of the General Theological Seminary. The article appeared in the *Anglican Theological Review,* July, 1940.

The earliest occurrence of the word "church" in Acts is 5:11. In the New Testament, "church" very often signifies the local Christian assembly. In Acts 19:32, "church" is used of the gathered Ephesian mob. In Acts 7:38, "church" signifies the Jewish congregation, the church in the wilderness, a concept apparently connected with Exod. 12:3 and Deut. 23:2.

The earliest Palestinian Christians did not employ the word "church" to describe the Christian group as a totality. They designated themselves as "way," that is, "way of observing the law," and then "only true way." Acts 9:2; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14, 22 and Hebr. 10:20 are illustrations. Compare also Mark 1:2 and parallel passages, John 14:4-6; II Pet. 2:15, 21 f.

The beginning of the "way" was the baptism of the Spirit which occurred at Pentecost. Since this outpouring was interpreted as an apocalyptic event (Acts 2:16-21), it signified that they had been saved and the new age was being inaugurated. So the saved stand with the judge instead of before him (I Thess. 4:15-17; I Cor. 6:3). Having been saved, Christians must point others to the "way" (Acts 2:36; Rom. 9:5). Hence the glad tidings must be announced to their fellow Jews and to gentiles. "Jesus is Messiah" was their message. And men must now accept or reject him as such. All Jews who thus accepted Jesus belonged to the Israel of God. The "way" included at first only the righteous in Israel.

As converts increased, an organization for the "way" rather parallel to the organization in Israel developed (Mark 11:27-33; Acts 21:18). Since the Spirit fell on the gentiles, they must be recognized as of the "way." But were gentile Christians also to be included in the congregation? Two answers were at first given by Christians. Some said, "No" (Acts 5:20; Matt. 5:17-19); others said, "Yes" (Gal. 3:3; Rom. 10:4; 4:12-16). The church concept included the two ideas of the "way" and the "congregation." To the third century the church signified such things as a visible body, a single whole, a local Christian group, a local Christian group at worship, saints. All within the church were holy, and wilful and gross sins were punished by excommunication (Acts 5:1-11; I Cor. 5:1 ff.). Since the Jewish congregation included both the good

and the bad, and the Christian church included only the good, the continuity between the Jewish view and the Christian view was broken.

Paul by emphasizing Christ-mysticism introduced a new idea, namely, that all Christians form one body or organism through which Christ acts, an organism "filled with life from a single source." The Johannine writings by emphasizing a God-mysticism introduced the idea of a totally good membership or perfect church in opposition to the world lying wholly in wickedness. In this way all connection between the church and Israel was cut, and the Old Testament in Johannine circles was henceforth employed merely to predict the coming of Christ (John 8:17; 10:34; 15:25). The Christian church represents a new beginning, being built on Christ, not on Abraham (Eph. 2:20-22; I Pet. 2:5; Matt. 16:18).

The only exceptions to this interpretation of the church as a body of saints to the end of the second century are met with in II Tim. 2:17-21 and the *Shepherd of Hermas*. But I Tim. 1:20 reveals that Hymenæus and Alexander have been handed over to Satan, thus cancelling the toleration found in II Tim. 2, and the *Shepherd of Hermas* pleads only for one more chance for one who has sinned. The church as a "society of sinners" finds next to no support in Christian literature to the beginning of the third century.

The author is convinced that the body of Christ can be discovered although "it has no outward forms by which it may be identified, no organization through which it functions, no priesthood or prophethood by which it is administered and proclaimed" (p. 276), although "Christ is not the head of the 'Presbyterian Church in the United States of America,' nor of the 'Methodist Church,' nor of the 'Church of England,' nor of any other body now in existence which calls itself a 'church'" (p. 278). How then, can the true and living church be found? The answer is "by stripping off the schismatic functions which our so-called 'churches' exercise." That will require quite a series of operations, but they are not too difficult for our author. Eight operations will work the miracle. In polity, the community must recover the original structure. Baptism must become a function of the whole body of Christ. Ordination must be recognized as a Catholic prerogative. "The missionary enterprise calls urgently for its emancipation from sectarian restraints and for its adoption as a catholic responsibility of the whole church" (p. 302). "Theological seminaries must be transferred from their traditional sectarian auspices, merged with one another and administered under some auspices provided by the whole church which alone is competent to mold the mind of a ministry that shall be truly catholic" (p. 306). Of course,

there must also be a catholic liturgy and a catholic eucharist and catholic creeds. But after reading p. 318, the path to the desired and desirable catholicity has not been pointed out. We seem to need a new Messiah and who can he be?

What Catholicism could say in reply to this proposal for an adventure in religious totalitarianism would require a volume. Various Protestant bodies may reply in various moods. But it seems very certain that the final interpretation of Protestantism will vindicate the religious significance of the Reformation, for it will seek to recover some of its original tolerance, that is, the freedom of the Christian man. It will abandon the vain attempt to secure unity through doctrinal statement or the establishment of a universal church. Rather it will seek to offer a new view of God, a new interpretation of man, a new goal for life to the perplexed men and women of this day of bewilderment. Since retreat toward the comfort of tradition, dogma, and literalism is cut off, the towering heights of the Christian way of life must be scaled. The modern love of truth, search for truth, and joy because of the discovery of truth must be dedicated to the advancement of the common good. The age-long tension in Protestantism resulting from its appeal to the Bible and its appeal to the right of the individual to experience God in his own way cannot be reduced by further subdivisions in the many existing varieties of Protestantism, but only by observing that the actual "marching orders" of Christianity are: "Be ye the salt of the earth, be ye the light of the world."

FREEDOM IN CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT

WILLIAM J. McGARRY, S.J.
Editor, *Theological Studies*

THE EDITOR of the CROZER QUARTERLY has been gracious enough to request some description of what is going on in Catholic theology and how much freedom a Catholic theologian enjoys in his science. It may strike theologians of non-Catholic denominations as surprising that anything at all is going on, in view of the alleged or tacitly assumed rigidity of Catholic tenets. These topics may serve, then, to inform the unaware, while at the same time it is hoped that they will interest the instructed.

The subject may be dealt with conveniently under three headings. It will be seen that our methodology in dealing with theological propositions opens a vast field of freedom to us. Again, the developable parts of theology lie open to investigation on a very wide scale. And finally, something may be said in this discussion about the topics which are not open to further free expression.

There is doctrinal rigidity in the case of those Catholic dogmas which have been *defined* by the Church. Thus, there is no freedom to deny the propositions that Jesus Christ is God or that God is one in nature and three in persons. Yet even in such articles of faith theological interest is not ended, because, as Catholic theology is expounded and studied, there are several headings under which each proposition may be viewed. Thus our very methodology opens up space for discussion.

The first heading looks to the most exact understanding of the terms of the proposition. These are defined, and, while definitions are pretty generally settled, as far as substantials are concerned, after so many centuries of study, there are fields which may still be explored. These parts of theology are still the objects of dispute among the various schools. Thus, while the notion of *person* is known (an intellectual, subsistent, incommunicable substance), the ultimate determinant of personality and the application of the definition to men, angels, the God-man, and the three divine Persons offer fields for divergent manners of exposition. Moreover, any disputes which pertain to philosophical terms are carried over into theology and have their effect. To illustrate: a statement that liberty or freedom is the ultimate determinant of personality, as Descartes and his followers claim, would lead to the heresy of

Nestorius if applied to Christ, for he was free as man and free as God, and yet was one in person.

The second heading of the theological thesis is the pronouncement of the living, teaching authority of the Roman Catholic Church. In the articles of faith, formulated by general councils or proclaimed by Roman pontiffs, the meaning of the propositions is clear enough. But there are hundreds of propositions in theology which are not thus defined. The importance of some heresy or the ever-restless mental and devotional energy of the Church may occasion the formulation of a proposition in an article of faith. Thus, in the sixteenth century many points of faith were defined in reaction to the propositions of Luther, Calvin, Chemnitz, Melancthon, and others. Again, heresy led to the definition that Mary is the Mother of God, in the fifth century, whereas devotion led to the definition of the Immaculate Conception in the nineteenth.

To propositions which are not infallibly defined, scientific theology appends one of several qualifications. A very frequent *note* is *certain and common,* that is, the proposition is supported by good arguments and is held as a conclusion by the masters of theology. Some of these opinions have been revoked in theology, and this is possible in the case where they depend in some measure on the data of science. An illustration of this point by examples will show how large (and busy) a field is free for the Catholic theologian.

Let us consider the geographical universality of the Flood. During the patristic age and long after, the opinion was universal that water covered the whole earth. The text of Genesis has many expressions understandable in a universal sense, and no reason appeared for restriction. But later, astronomy, geology, and zoölogy showed that this sense cluttered the narration with difficulties. The text was reëxamined and it was seen that the words of a simple narrator, retailing events of his land and within his purview, could be understood of a region of the earth as well as of its whole surface. Hence, gradually the common opinion fell in with the view that the Deluge was a local phenomenon, though of vast proportions.

The second example will illustrate an opinion in process of discussion. It comes out of the first example. Given that the Deluge was local, that probably it originated out of continuous rains plus a geological subsidence comparable to the depression caused by one's finger on a tennis ball, may it not be that migrating men had already passed over the horizon of the rim and thus escaped the destructive waters? In a word, ought we or may we modify the common and certain opinion that the Flood drowned all men?

The story of Genesis may be said to leave the question unanswered, but another pericope must be kept in mind. In I Pet. 3:20-21, those saved in the ark are the type of those saved through baptism. Now a typical sense in the Bible is the one intended by God, in contrast to scriptural accomodation which is human analogizing. Hence the question arises, should not the absolute universality of the need of baptism indicate an absolute universality of those who perished or were saved in the Flood? Or would it be sufficient to say that a relative totality in the Deluge prefigures an absolute totality in the matter of the need of baptism? *Adhuc sub judice*—a nice point which between 1870 and 1910 gave rise to dozens of brochures. After the long controversy some theologians still thought that all men except the eight in the ark died; there are a few who qualify this note "most probable."

Still another example will illustrate the disputes, changes of opinion, and the freedom of Catholic theologians, but freedom within limits. What is the Catholic Church's stand on evolution? Its basic thesis of continuity—mundane effects are *exclusively* to be accounted for by mundane causes—is rejected, for this is atheism. Theistic evolution—God acts with mundane causes only as the *Author of Nature*—is rejected, for this rules out miracles, makes impossible Christ's divinity, virgin birth, resurrection. Evolution's claim that Christianity or the Christian church is a natural product of religious movements (Judaistic, hellenistic, others) is a denial of what can be proved even by reason as well as by revelation about the Incarnation and the supernatural nature of the Church. Note that both reason and revelation are drawn upon in Catholic theology in support of these points.

But what of man's body? The data of scientists may not yet have proved man's arboreal descent, but several lines of evidence seem to converge upon it. What, then, of the *slime* of Gen. 2:7? Literally the text says that God dealt immediately with non-living matter, and the effect of God's breathing into it a soul was the production of a *sentient animal*—that is the sense of *nephesh ḥayyah.* So clear was this sense that a century ago theologians were saying that it was believable out of clear Scripture that God formed man's body out of clay. This was common teaching.

It is still common teaching but with a difference. The *immediate* formation of man's body is not said now to be an exclusive interpretation of the text. Possibly, there are some who say, there were intermediate living forms between the clay and the man. But until the data of scientists are of sufficient strength and certainty to show reason why one may withdraw from an opinion long held, the thesis

will still be maintained that Adam's body was directly formed from the earth.

Christian theologians are not rushing into this so popular monkey-business and for their tardiness they are running the risk of being called stodgy, sticky, and stupid. But *pace scientistarum—pseudo- et veri nominis,* there is more to the story than meets the eye glued to the microscope in search of somatic similarities. I dare say a very small percentage of biologists or anthropologists reflect on the relation of their evolution to Adam's fall. Most evolutionists maintain that dozens or hundreds of men evolved out of male primates, and that dozens or hundreds of women evolved out of female primates; and some of the evolutionists show their gallantry by saying the ladies came first.

Yet revelation says there is one Saviour of all men, that through obedience he restored what the first Adam lost, that he enabled us to win again that grace of which descent from Adam has sent us into life deprived. In a word, all men are of Adam's blood and have Adam's sin by descent from him. And so, if there is question at all of an evolution of man's body, the question pertains to the body of a single first ancestor. Now this fact is known extra-scientifically, and it is regrettable that so few non-Catholic scientists are aware of or welcome extra-scientific knowledge—which, of course, does not diminish its truth but only its acceptance.

The next three headings under which theological propositions are considered are the three sources of proof of a proposition: the Bible, Apostolic Tradition, and Reason. Not all theses are provable in all three sources. Obviously reason cannot prove a Triune God, for it is only through revelation that we can know with certainty that every individual, rational nature is not a person. Every such nature we know is a person and vice versa; it is said that Aristotle vaguely guessed that nature and person were not identical, at least in formal definition, but even he did not know they were separable. But in Christ there is a perfect human nature, yet no human personality. In such theses reason is put to its utmost to distinguish apparent from real contradictions.

Again, Catholic theology is not pledged to the principle that all revelation is exclusively biblical. Our theologians find an insuperable difficulty here since the Bible itself does not state this fundamental rule of faith, nor does it give a list of what books we should catalogue properly as biblical. Yet our sharp contrast to the views of orthodox Protestant theologians does not lead to a neglect of the biblical sources of theology. There are few propositions for which scriptural support is not cited even when they do not prove them with certainty. Thus Eph.

5: 22 ff. is lengthily developed to show the sacred character of marriage, but an apodictic proof that marriage is a sacrament cannot be gathered out of the text alone. It is obvious that the myriad disputable questions of scriptural exegesis and the thousands of topics which pertain to Catholic tradition, descending from the apostles through apologists, fathers, scholastics, and modern theologians, supply a free field of study too vast for a single mind to roam. Since the master and guide of modern Catholic theology is the peerless St. Thomas, he may be regarded as the narrow channel of the hourglass. The philosophy and theological erudition of the past coursed through him, was gathered into a vast and superb synthesis, and spread out again in those who followed. Each grain of sand has beauties and depths for our study.

Finally, the theological thesis is defended against those who deny it, doubt it, or attack it. The plethora of objections to each thesis creates work, for they have grown with the centuries. They are not always new—thus modern humanists have added little to Pelagius. But they are interesting—thus St. Cyprian has been and will be searched and "researched" in favor of a branch theory of the Church.

A second field of freedom of theological thought is open to us in discussing what may be called developable propositions in theology. The development of dogma is a topic easily misunderstood. Commonly enough it is said that entirely *new* articles are added. Was not the definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 a *new* dogma? If not, how was it the articulation of an ancient faith? The Catholic answer lies in attending to two propositions: 1. Only that which is contained in revelation is definable. 2. Only the Church can declare this infallibly. With the first of these propositions we are concerned principally in dealing with developable parts of theology.

These may be contained *implicitly* in articles already admitted. Now what is implicit might not be perceived or adverted to for long centuries. It may be vaguely and then increasingly suggested and for a long time be disputed; some may deny it is implicitly asserted and some may claim that it is, and for any number of reasons. Eventually the opinion that it is contained implicitly in revelation may gain a consent on the part of the whole Church—pontiffs, bishops, scholars, laity. When such a proposition has been thus held as part of revelation (biblical or traditional) it is then called definable; it may be defined by a general council or by the Pope.

To illustrate: Old Testament prophecies, New Testament texts, early and late tradition, considerations of the office and function of the Blessed Virgin, her similarity to (not equality with) her Son, converge

upon the proposition that Mary the Mother of God was most holy, most near God, most intimately associated with Christ in his being and work as Man. How far do these data of revelation carry us in their implicit suggestions? Three Marian doctrines serve to point the general principles outlined above.

First, is her holiness so great as to allow us to say that never was she without God's grace? Was she prevented from feeling the effects of the fall rather than redeemed after suffering its essential loss? In a word, does her high holiness mean she was conceived immaculately? During four centuries this question was not adverted to. Then it was suggested, and increasingly thought of, during six more centuries; in the Middle Ages it was disputed, not because Mary's holiness was doubted, but because possession of grace from the first instant of existence was considered a unique prerogative of the sacred humanity of Christ and because the possession of grace by another would seem to lessen the universality of Christ's redemptive act. This stage of controversy passed when the distinction of Scotus in the fourteenth century allowed us to see the difference between a preventive and reparative redemption. During three more centuries other difficulties were seen not to affect the issue. Agreement concerning the doctrine shortly became universal. Yet only in the nineteenth century was it defined.

From the same sources, the holiness of Mary, her similarity to Christ, her intimacy in the work of redemption, came the suggestion that Mary was assumed into heaven after her death. This is the doctrine of the Assumption. For four centuries it was not greatly adverted to, though it appeared. Then it became a popular devotional doctrine. It scarcely went through a stage of controversy. It has been a definable doctrine for centuries. But it is not yet an article of faith. However, the denial (and no one who knows Marian theology is inclined that way) is qualified as *rash* theologically and since a definable doctrine is *near* faith, disbelief in it is *near* heresy.

Again, the headings cited from Mariological revelation give rise to a doctrine now in the stage of controversy. In what measure may the Mother of God be given the title Co-Redeemer? If she has any function now in distributing grace, the fruits of redemption, had she any role in acquiring them? If so, how largely or how little and what graces? Or is her coöperation in redemption merely a unique physical role of a virgin mother? Certain substantials in this controversy are easily determined, but there are very many points which are properly the object of further dispute with a view to ultimate clarification.

The possibility of free discussion under such headings is very great,

and it may be said that in all parts of theology there are similar questions which are taken up after the substantial bearing of explicit revelation has been thoroughly understood. Mention may be made of questions yet to be worked out concerning the Mystical Body of Christ, the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation, the fall, sin, the causality of the sacraments with respect to grace. These examples are drawn from dogmatic theology. If we turn to canon law and moral theology, we find a thousand disputed points concerning conduct and law along with the ten thousand certainties. Then there are the myriad questions of biblical science, liturgy, asceticism, mystical theology, church history. Our difficulty is not to find freedom, but to find time to enjoy the freedom we have.

This thought brings our discussion to our third heading, concerning those parts of theology in which Catholics are said not to be free. Among non-Catholics there has grown up an opinion that on many issues we are not free at all; and from this has arisen a fallacious generality that anyone who subscribes to an authoritarian system has surrendered, and with indignity, his human freedom. We are said to have cut and dried, immutable, untouchable views on God's existence, on the supernatural order, on the founding of the Church, and on a hundred other questions which the scholars of today are handling most freely, giving play to skepticism or assent, enjoying an independence of mind impossible in our case.

Let us examine this opinion and see what freedom of the mind is. The intellect is made for truth; it seeks truth; it is satisfied only when it possesses truth; it is quiescent and content when it perceives the evidence of truth; truth does not shackle it; truth satisfies it and leaves it free for its ever-restless quest for more truth. Thus, I am satisfied that two and two are four and he is but an inane mathematical tinkerer who tells me my mind is not free because I assent. I know from a thousand witnesses that a war is going on in Europe. I assent; this act of human faith does not shackle me. I am unnatural if I do not assent.

If we apply these same principles to theology, why must one be charged with authoritarian shackling who knows with certainty and by the data both of reason and faith, that many things are true? We know, for instance, that God's existence can be proved by reason. Theologians have gone over the proofs, tested them from every angle, refuted the objections made to them—and then have been astounded at the discussions of the "free," and have wondered if John Q. Americanus has ever gotten down to serious enough philosophical thinking to enable him to appreciate what is proved and what is sought to be proved in rational

theism. "Refutations" of theistic arguments have appeared which evince the writers' ignorance of the argument, its purview, its methodology. Kant is so easily and frequently alleged to have routed the scholastics that few read his very superficial strictures, or, if they do, they do not juxtapose the arguments of theism.

When a mind has truth, freedom is lost, not gained, by Cartesian doubting. Fair questioning, examination, and refinement of thought are always legitimate and they will be found among Catholics. Within the last four years two articles have appeared by Catholic theologians with a view to show that the deontological argument *singly* cannot prove God's existence. Moreover, among us, while X cannot say either in reason or faith that God's existence cannot be proved, he can say that Y's argument does not prove it; and that is helpful and free even when the dispute is hot.

Again, in the matter of the supernatural, Catholic theologians are constantly astounded to find that it is "freedom" to rule it out, when this is equivalent to saying that a Creator is bound down by the "iron" laws of his own molecules. If God is God at all, he *can* intervene—to reveal, to work miracles, to come as God-Man, if he will. Did he? That is historical fact—and not to be ruled out aprioristically because devotees at the shrine of Bernheim fall down and adore naturalistic historical continuity. If history is concerned, let us get to the sources of testimony—fairly, not eviscerating them through some conceptual and subjective norm that is based on exclusive naturalism. Within one month of writing these lines a book has appeared in which the repeated charge is made that a supernaturalist viewpoint precludes any success in the search for the "real Jesus." Such a charge astounds Catholic theologians who have studied the excellently conceived treatises in apologetics which have appeared in the last half-century, and they ask if non-Catholics are given the opportunity of investigating, step by step, with rigid and remorseless logic, the road from reason and nature to revelation and supernature. For nearly one year of a four-year theological course we are engaged in building and testing the bridge from philosophy and science to theology; hence we may say with all modesty that we know whereof we speak when we are freed by truth and reason and when we are "shackled." Authoritarianism does not necessarily shackle the mind. When it does so improperly, the mind naturally revolts at its falsities. But error does shackle the mind and not with one chain but with endlessly connected fetters.

Let me end this paper with a description of the ordinary experience of a Catholic theological student. He comes into theology with the faith;

he is sure of it; he is not an eclectic; he is not viewy; he knows that hundreds (equally at least as brilliant, even if he dreams he is an Aquinas) have gone over all the bumps of the road and found faith strengthened. But on the other hand, he has had two or three years' training in pure philosophy, that is, in a mental discipline where authority is the weakest of proofs. This has trained him in analysis; it makes him weigh the proofs and question them; he "wants to know"; he is no skeptic, but the professor knows (*crede experto*) that his mind is alert, inquisitive, balanced, unprejudiced; he is bitten by the gadfly, "have reason for the faith that is in you."

As the four years of theology roll by and the vast panorama of the Divine science is spread before the eyes, question upon question occurs, beauty upon beauty is perceived, depth after depth is plummeted. Now revelation leads and reason sees not why it should not follow on; now revelation calls on reason to bear the load yet farther. Here faith perceives but obscurely, and the beacon of reason shines. There reason falters, seems almost to stumble, and faith lifts it on. Freedom! God knows there is freedom and joy in all the truths of man and animal and plant and earth, but for empyrean realms and limitless expanses of it one must delve into the queen of the sciences.

SPEAKING OF CHALLENGES

HENRY C. NEWELL
First Congregational Church, Harwich, Massachusetts

THESE are days that try men's souls, and the soul of the minister is no exception. However, despite the difficulties, there are occasional experiences which lend encouragement to the thoughtful preacher and at the same time offer material for earnest consideration. Such an experience has recently come the way of the writer. Doubtless mine has been an exceptionally fortunate pastoral experience since much of it has been among young people, many of them students in college, and in the inspiring environment of the college community. Out of such a relationship came the reunion which I have just enjoyed.

Among those who came back for the occasion was a young and brilliant surgeon who not so long ago was captain of his university's football team. Possessed of an unusually attractive personality he was voted high in the scale of popularity in his school, and since entering the actual practice of his profession has had unusual opportunities, both social and professional, to know what the average man is thinking.

Making himself comfortable on the study couch in front of the open fire he turned upon me with this somewhat unexpected question: "Well, Dominie, what are you preaching about these days?" I suppose my answer was rather non-committal; at any rate it was not satisfactory, for he fired back, "No, I mean it; I want to know what you are preaching about. These are great days for the Christian church if she only realizes it, and I am interested to find out what you preachers are saying."

Of course my answer was obvious. It was to bid him go to church and find out for himself. But he was not thus to be reproved or placated. "Go to church," he said, "why since we settled in the city my wife and I have been accepting the invitations of friends to go with them to various churches—churches of which they are members—and, while I can't go every Sunday (you know how it is with a doctor), still I have done pretty well and the Lady of the House has gone rather regularly somewhere; but in all the town we have found only one or two men whom I want to give my time listening to. Most of the men I have heard want me to believe things I know are not so, and some others hashed over old stuff which the world's recent grim experience has proved inadequate. We know we need spiritual help, my wife and I, but in most of the churches we visited we did not get it. In these days

we would like to know what we can believe, and we want someone to tell us convincingly."

"Well," I replied, "I wish there were more like you two."

And then he really surprised me.

"More like us," he answered, "there are thousands like us! Dominie, I meant it when I said these are great days for the Christian church if she only knows it. From what people say who come into my office, and from my various social contacts, I am sure there are literally thousands of people who sincerely desire to know what, if anything, they may honestly believe. What can we believe, Dominie? What do *you* believe?"

Presently perhaps I will suggest what I told him, but first let me say that it was mightily encouraging to find such a man deeply interested in religion. More than that, the encouragement was heightened by the fact that he could honestly report a goodly number of his own acquaintance vitally concerned to know what to believe. Among them, of course, were some who know, or at any rate think they know, but many of these failed to convince the enquiring mind. There were Oxford groupers whose emotional balance the doctor questioned; there were fundamentalists who accepted with enthusiasm much that he could not accept at all; and there were the liberals! Liberals so liberal that they dispensed with God altogether, and liberals who were liberal so long as everybody else thought as they did, but whose attitude was anything but liberal toward those who differed. But besides these, he bade me rest assured, are hosts of men and women who seek spiritual guidance that they may confidently take hold of the task of building a better world. It is to find such guidance that he and his young wife are searching the churches of their city.

Symptomatic of their times, characteristic of their generation, their doubts followed two general lines of question: What about God? What about humanity? Put simply they are asking, "Can we still believe in God? Can we still believe in democracy?" Because they represent a goodly portion of America's younger people, the church may rejoice at the opportunity which lies open before it. Here is the challenge of our day!

What did I tell this young surgeon? Well, it is not so important what I told him—though I shall indicate here the general line of my thinking—as it is to emphasize the fact that the first and fundamental characteristic of the minister who would really help his fellows must be honesty. If he is not willing to be honest with himself, the minister today would best not preach at all; indeed he would best not enter the ministry. And if he is honest with himself, it seems probable that he

will relegate to the realm of frank speculation much of the theology which is often preached as proven fact. On the other hand it seems probable that he will find himself possessed of two articles of faith which will serve as foundation stones for useful living. It may not seem like much of a creed, but at least he will not be committed to exaggeration nor will he necessarily set narrow limits to his development if he permits himself these two articles of belief: "I believe in God; I believe in Man." Now just what variations may be played on these two basic themes will of course depend upon the personal experience of the individual. For some it may well be that the hurt that life can do will make even these two—and especially the second—right difficult. For others the wealth of spiritual experience may permit the honest repetition of the entire Apostles' Creed without a single mental reservation. Far be it from the writer to set himself up as judge in such matters. The essential thing is that young people be sure that their minister is honest in his thinking, and sincere in his utterance.

Probably we greatly need to simplify our presentation of the Christian gospel. Our interest in presenting the particular theological or sociological emphasis which may be the mind of the moment, or our own personal prejudice, leads us to neglect the simplicity and to forget the common sense of essential Christianity. We forget that essential Christianity is simple to state though difficult to practice. It is easy enough to repeat the two great commandments upon which, Jesus taught, "hang all the law and the prophets," but it is not so easy to apply those two commandments in the everyday relationships of practical life. Yet in these two commandments we have the very essence of Christianity. We have complicated them by our human interpretations of man-made creeds until we have rendered ourselves almost unable to appreciate the beautiful simplicity of the religion of Jesus. That these two commandments may receive expression through widely differing media is a fact of continual observation. Among all the Christian denominations, among men of other religions and of no professed religion, we find individuals who by their lives testify to sincere love for God and sincere love for their fellow men. Such individuals are followers of Jesus Christ quite regardless of the label which may be attached to them. Is it not becoming possible to simplify the Christian message to a point where very considerable creedal differences, and differences in forms of worship, may be permitted without prejudice to the individual provided he be sincere, and provided he give sincere allegiance to the two essential commands?

Such simplification may awaken in the mind of the reader the same reaction which occurred in the case of the young surgeon. We considered

several of the vexed problems of theology and frankly discarded some of the conventional statements of belief, the doctor exclaiming with each new discard, "Well, we will throw that out." But when he had finished we still had left a firm belief in God and a firm belief in Man, two articles of faith which the young man admitted could be honestly believed in.

"But," he remonstrated, "this is not Christianity."

So also the reader may assert that we have carried simplification too far; no longer do we have Christianity. I wonder. It is not the Christianity of conventional creeds and abstruse doctrines, but does it not more closely approximate the simple faith of the Master as we gather the facts from the gospel story? The younger groups in our modern churches will find their chief trouble with such simplification not in the elimination of doctrine but in the Christian interpretation of God. To assert that the universe gives evidence of a background of mind and purpose, and to call that mind and purpose God will command the assent of the honest scientist, but to say of that mind and purpose that it maintains a definitely beneficent attitude toward the human race—to say nothing of each human personality—"ay, there's the rub!" To sustain the Christian interpretation of God as a loving father of mankind in the face of grim realities of human suffering is indeed a challenge to the Christian church. It is a challenge to the preacher; it is also quite definitely a challenge to the teacher.

Recently within the same month the columns of a widely read and highly respected religious journal carried two apparently contradictory interpretations of God. The first was contained in an editorial comment on an invitation issued by a teacher in a Texas college who called upon her friends to rejoice with her "honoring the golden anniversary of her conversion." "What singing faith there is," writes the editor, "in these words from the Psalms with which by reference she summed up in letters of gold a half-century of victorious living: 'For the Lord God is a sun and a shield; the Lord will give grace and glory; no good thing will he withhold from them that walk uprightly. O Lord of hosts, blessed is the man that trusteth in thee.'"

Two weeks later the same journal reported without comment Dr. Einstein's statement before the conference of scholars gathered at the Jewish Theological Seminary in Manhattan, in which he urged the giving up of the idea of a personal God.

At first comparison the two paragraphs seem to report wholly contradictory ideas, and in fact they do present two entirely different approaches to God. They are not necessarily contradictions, however, and the church must find the synthesis which will unite the apparently

conflicting statements in their fundamental unity. It is so easy to be content with purely anthropomorphic concepts when dealing not alone with God but with the idea of personality as well.

It is probably significant that the first quotation came from a teacher of English while the second is the word of a distinguished scientist. Here we have in stark opposition to each other the point of view of the classics as over against that of science. The teacher of English rejoices in the "Lord God who is sun and shield." The scientist sees the God of law and is so impressed by that phase of the divine that he would have us eliminate any other approach. Doubtless it is this shift of emphasis in our educational curricula from classics to science which has been in no small degree responsible for the so-called conflict between science and religion. Presently we trust we shall come to a better balance between the mysticism of the classics and the hard-headed practicality of science, but before the balance is restored it will be well for us to give serious consideration to the scientist's concept of God and reflect upon the fact that this is a universe of law, and that there is much still to be discovered about laws in other than material realms. The mind and purpose behind the universe is by no means limited to the material realm, and we can no more successfully defy the laws of God in the moral realm than in the material. We have at last come to a situation where we no longer expect physical laws to be suspended for our personal benefit. It will be a wholesome lesson if from the grim experience through which the nations of the world are now passing we can learn that neither individuals nor nations can break the moral law and get away with it. Alas that the lesson must be learned at such tremendous cost!

Presently, however, we shall come to discover that the God of love and the God of law is one and the same God. We as individuals will share the secret of the teacher of English in the Texas college and rejoice in a personal experience of God. We as nations will sufficiently grasp the implications of the moral law to build a human brotherhood which will not be satisfied until it includes every last tribe on earth, and membership in that brotherhood will be based upon the fact that every human personality is a child of God. Here at long last is the final and enduring foundation for democracy.

"Other sheep I have which are not of this fold"—is it too much to hope that ultimately the spirit of Jesus Christ will so pervade the human race that men of wholly different faiths, Mohammedan, Hindu, what you will, will join with Christian and Jew in recognizing the unity of the human family? And may that not be the consummation of religious unity devoutly desired by all right-thinking men? Will it not in fact

be the realization of the kingdom of God on earth for which the Christian church is praying and working?

"But the people are not ready for it"—this was the young surgeon's reaction to the ideas suggested above. "I can believe in and work for a plan like that, but most people are not ready for it. It involves too revolutionary a program, too radical changes in the accepted formulæ of conventional Christianity." The young man's face lighted with a wistful hope. I wonder. Are not the people ready for it? Of this I am quite sure: Only the taking seriously of those two fundamental laws which Jesus declared carry the very essence of eternal life, and earnestly attempting their practical application in business, society, and politics will ever transform our modern world into the kingdom of God. To love God with the whole personality, to love our neighbors as ourselves—are not the people ready for it?

"Dominie, there are thousands like us."

This is today's challenge to the Christian church.

SOME FACTS ABOUT PALESTINE

GEORGE RICKER BERRY
Colgate-Rochester Divinity School

THE land of Palestine is of small size, containing approximately 10,000 square miles. There are several places in its central ridge of mountains north of Samaria from which one can see its eastern and western boundaries, the Jordan valley and the Mediterranean Sea. From the walls of Jerusalem the grim mountains of Moab on the east of the Dead Sea are clearly visible, usually enemy territory in Old Testament times.

About half the area of Palestine is not suitable for cultivation, being mountainous, rocky, or desert. The country is now rather densely populated. It has an (estimated) population of about 1,350,000, of which 900,000 are Arabs and 450,000 Jews. It is more than three times as densely populated as the state of Vermont. That state, only slightly smaller, with 9,124 square miles, had a population, according to the census of 1930, of 359,611.

The frequent Old Testament phrase describing Palestine as a land "flowing with milk and honey," if it was intended to express abundance, must be regarded as an exaggeration. Palestine is not a fertile country, and probably never was at any time in its history. Its rainfall is inadequate for the best results. The total yearly rainfall at Jerusalem is approximately the same as at London, about 26 inches. But while at London this rainfall comes all through the year, in Palestine it is poorly distributed, most of it being in the months of December, January, and February. The winter rains are followed by a long summer without rain, and the summer is so hot that vegetation soon dries up; hence the growing season is short. In recent years, irrigation, principally from wells, has been practiced considerably, particularly by the Jews, but the possibilities of much further development of that practice are doubtful. Several crops, such as apples and potatoes, cannot be grown successfully in the country without irrigation.

The land of Palestine has three lakes. The Sea of Galilee is best known. Some miles north of this and near the headwaters of the Jordan is a small lake known as Lake Huleh (probably called Merom in the Old Testament). The waters of the Jordan empty into another lake, known as the Dead Sea.

Many events in the ministry of Jesus took place around the Sea of Galilee, which has, therefore, a special interest for Christians. This lake

is a pleasing body of water, surrounded for the most part by gently sloping hills; it reminds one of an English lake.

The Dead Sea is much more impressive than the Sea of Galilee. This lake traditionally has a bad name. Until recently it was believed that a miasma arose from the waters and so no birds could fly over it. Such ideas, however, are purely imaginary; I have seen birds flying over the lake. This lake is unique in some respects. It is the lowest body of water on the earth, its surface being about 1,300 feet below sea-level; the bottom of the lake, at its deepest part, is 1,300 feet lower. It is also the saltiest body of water on the earth, containing 24-26 % of solids in solution, while sea water has 4-6 %. Of course, no living creature can exist in its waters. The reason for the extreme saltiness of the water is that the lake has no outlet; all the waters of the Jordan, as well as the waters of other rivers, notably the Arnon, empty into it and are evaporated.

The east and the west shores of the Dead Sea are for the most part precipitous hills or mountains, generally several hundred feet in height; the mountain of Masada, on the west, rises to 1,700 feet above the Dead Sea. These shores consist largely of Nubian sandstone, with an overlying layer of limestone. This overlying layer has been mostly eroded on the east but remains on the west. The Nubian sandstone has a great variety of colors, red being prominent. The gorge of the Arnon, on the east side, is very impressive. This is a cleft in the rock with perpendicular sides, probably made by an earthquake, the gorge having a width of fifty to sixty-five feet. The rocks at the entrance are about 170 feet high, growing higher as one ascends the river. They show the characteristic variety of colors in great profusion. The gorge is winding, and extends back for several miles with the same general character. It reminds one of the *Siq,* the gorge which is the regular entrance to Petra.

At the southwest end of the Dead Sea is a remarkable mountain called Jebel Usdum (mountain of Sodom); the name, like others in this region, doubtless does not represent any genuine ancient tradition. This so-called mountain is really a hill, with its base for the most part extending to the water's edge. It extends from northwest to southeast for about four miles; it is five-eighths of a mile wide at the base, and has an extreme height of about 430 feet. The lower part consists of extremely pure crystallized salt, reaching at times a height of 170 feet, above which is a mixture of gypsum, clay, and chalky soil.

Two curious formations at widely separated points on the shore of the Dead Sea were pointed out to me as Lot's wife. The modern name of the sea is Bahr Lut (Sea of Lot).

The common tradition locates Sodom and Gomorrah at the southern end of the lake; some in recent times have argued for the north end. The question is not important, in my view, as the historical basis for the story of these cities is very doubtful.

Palestine is singularly lacking in natural resources. It has no coal, no iron or other metals, and no lumber. A small amount of firewood is on sale, coming principally from trimming the olive trees. It has but a small amount of water power. Until recent years most articles manufactured in the country were handmade; under Zionism some factories have been established, principally in Tel Aviv, for the manufacture of furniture, iron objects, knitted goods, etc. Many things must be imported, and there are few things to be exported. The largest item in the export list is Jaffa oranges, large oranges of unsurpassed flavor. The quantity of these produced for export has increased rapidly in recent years.

Palestine has been under the rule of Moslems since the Mohammedan conquest in the seventh century A.D., with the exception of the period of the crusades and a few years at other times. The inhabitants have been largely Arabs since the Mohammedan conquest. (It is recognized, of course, that the Arabs are a mixed stock; the Bedouin Arabs are of purer blood than the settled inhabitants of Palestine, but they are not entirely free from alien admixture.) The Moslem rule was brought to an end by the British conquest of Palestine in 1917 and 1918. There have been native Christians in the country ever since the time of Christ. The Christians in Palestine at the present time number over 90,000, of whom somewhat more than 70,000 are classed as Arabs. There have always been a few Jews in the country; their number, however, since 70 A.D., was small until the recent Zionist immigration.

Palestine at present is governed by Great Britain under a mandate given to it by the League of Nations. All power in national matters resides in the British government; any order of the High Commissioner and Executive Council is law. Organizations of the Jews and Arabs have advisory power only. All high officials and many subordinate officials are British. The cities and villages, however, are in most respects self-governing. The British have faced a difficult task in Palestine, because of the conflicting interests of the Arabs and the Jews, and in general have accomplished the task remarkably well.

The most important cities in Palestine are Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and Haifa. Tel Aviv is situated on land which was simply sand dunes at the beginning of this century. The settlement there was at first intended as a Jewish suburb of Jaffa, but in a few years it became an independent

city. It is situated on the shore of the Mediterranean, just north of Jaffa. It has had a phenomenal growth, its present population being about 150,000, almost entirely Jews.

Haifa is important as having the only natural harbor in Palestine, and actually the sole harbor; there is only an open roadstead at Jaffa and Tel Aviv. Haifa is situated on the bay of Acre, at the foot of Mount Carmel, with a considerable population on the summit of Mount Carmel. The harbor is well protected by a breakwater, built a few years ago, and has good docks. The oil pipe line from Iraq has a mouth here, another being at Tripoli in Syria. The city has grown rapidly in the past few years.

Acre was an important harbor in the time of the Crusades. This has the same natural advantages as Haifa, it being at the north end of the bay of Acre, and Haifa at the south. Acre is not used as a harbor to any extent at the present time.

Jerusalem is an ancient city. It was a thriving city at about 1450 B.C., at which time it was mentioned in the Tell-el-Amarna letters under the name of Urusalim. (Most of these letters were written by Egyptian officials in Palestine to their over-lord, the king of Egypt, during the reigns of Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV, the latter being better known by his later name Ikhnaton.) In the Old Testament the name of the city is regularly Jerusalem. The name Jebus appears as an alternative designation in two places, Jud. 19:10; I Chron. 11:4, applied to it when occupied by the Jebusites. The city was captured from the Jebusites by King David (II Sam. 5:6-9). In 70 A.D., following a rebellion of the Jews, it was captured and more or less destroyed by the Roman emperor Titus. The city was rebuilt as a Roman town by the emperor Hadrian in 134 A.D., and named Ælia Capitolina. The city has always been surrounded by walls, from the time of the Jebusites on. The present walls were built by the Turkish sultan Suleiman the Magnificent in 1542. Some large stones near the base of the walls are doubtless the remains of earlier walls. It is doubtful, however, whether any portions of the present walls were standing in the time of Christ. The present so-called David's Tower, just inside the Jaffa Gate, is on the site of a tower built by Herod the Great, but it is doubtful if any part of Herod's tower remains; possibly part of the foundation may be from his time.

The houses of Jerusalem are built of native limestone. There are but few vacant spaces within the walls. For the most part the houses inside the walls are crowded together, and the streets are narrow and crooked, many being paved with cobblestones. It is now forbidden to

erect any new buildings in the old city within the walls. The old city is an irregular square, about half a mile, or a little more, on each side. It is divided into four sections, a Christian section, in which is located the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, an Armenian section, which is also Christian of course, a Jewish section, and a Moslem section, the last-named including the temple area, the *Haram esh-Sherif*. The old city has about 25,000 inhabitants, the new city about 75,000. The new city extends for the most part to the north and west of the old city. The Arabic name for Jerusalem is el-Quds (The Holy).[1]

There are some curious anomalies in Jerusalem. The doorkeepers of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre are a Moslem family, who have been the traditional keepers of the keys for centuries. This family has the duty of locking and unlocking the doors of the church; its responsibilities end at that point. The first station of the cross, as will be noticed elsewhere, is in the courtyard of a Moslem school. The Jewish Wailing Wall, revered by the Jews as a sacred spot, is Moslem property. Many of the Jews believe it to be the west wall of the temple. It is certainly not that, since it is too far to the west, not to mention the fact that the temple was completely destroyed long ago. It is now a part of the west wall of the temple enclosure; it is probably not ancient, although it contains some massive stones. The temple enclosure, mostly a large open space containing two principal buildings, the beautiful Dome of the Rock and the mosque of el-Aqsa, is Moslem property. The Dome of the Rock is often, but improperly, called the Mosque of Omar; it is not a mosque. There actually is a mosque of Omar in Jerusalem, a small mosque close to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Visitors are allowed in the temple inclosure, in normal times. There is no restriction on this privilege, but many orthodox Jews will not enter this area, for fear that they may be treading on some sacred object buried in the ground, particularly the ark of the covenant.

The varied strains in the history of Palestine find expression in some of the street names in Jerusalem. In the old city, the street running east from the Jaffa Gate is David Street. The principal north and south street is called *Suq,* an Arabic word meaning *market.* This and David Street are actually the most important market streets. Christian Street is at the back of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and near by is Saint Francis Street, which runs by the large Franciscan monastery.

In the new city there is King George V Avenue, and also Princess Mary Road. Saladin Street runs north from Herod's Gate. There is the Street of the Prophets, and also Saint Paul's Road. Julian's Way, with

[1] An excellent map of Jerusalem was published in *Life* for Nov. 28, 1938.

some of the newer fine stores, is named for the Roman emperor Julian, known in history as The Apostate; in popular speech this street is often called Saint Julian's Way.

For most people the chief charm of Palestine comes from its association with the three great monotheistic religions. It is sacred to the Jews, because it was their home for centuries and the site of their temple. It is sacred to Christians, because it was the birthplace of Jesus and the scene of his ministry. To the Moslems, also, Jerusalem has a sacredness second only to that of Mecca, because the temple area at Jerusalem is said in Moslem tradition to have been the place from which Mohammed set out on a miraculous night journey to heaven, and to which he returned after the journey.

Palestine is a land of innumerable traditions, principally Christian. Christian tradition identifies the site of every important event connected with the life of Jesus and of the early disciples. However, there are variant traditions. Often the tradition of the Greek Orthodox Church points to one place, while the tradition of the Roman Catholic Church (in Palestine usually called the Latin Church) has a different identification. Thus the place of Stephen's martyrdom in the Latin tradition is on the Nablus Road, a little north of the Damascus Gate, where the Dominican monastery is situated, while the Greek tradition puts it in the Valley of Kedron, east of Jerusalem.

In general it may be said that no reliance can be placed upon any of these traditions. None of them can be proved to be older than the time of Constantine, in the fourth century A.D., and many of them are more recent than that. In fact, the only precise spot that can be identified with a reasonable degree of certainty as the site of any act of Jesus is the so-called Jacob's well (John 4), near Nablus (ancient Shechem), the only well in that vicinity.

The Church of the Holy Sepulchre is located on the traditional place of the crucifixion and burial of Jesus, this tradition going back to the time of Constantine. The origin of that tradition, however, was in a story of the miraculous identification of the true cross by Helena, the mother of Constantine, a story which cannot be regarded as having any historical value. The place just outside the north wall of Jerusalem, known as Gordon's Calvary, preferred by many as the site of the crucifixion, has no conclusive evidence in its favor. The best conclusion seems to be that the actual place of the crucifixion is unknown.

There is a procession, conducted by the Franciscans, which visits each of the fourteen stations of the cross every Friday afternoon, with brief prayers at each one. No reliance can be placed, however, upon the

identification of these sites; many of the traditions about them are quite modern.

The locations of these stations reveal a curious mixture. The first station, Pilate's judgment hall, is in the court of a school maintained by the Moslem Supreme Council. The second station is at the Convent of the Flagellation, a Franciscan monastery. Stations three and four are in the Armenian Catholic Cathedral of Our Lady of the Spasm. (The curious name of this cathedral comes from the fact that, according to tradition, this is the place where the Virgin Mary fainted.) The fifth station is at a small Latin chapel, the Chapel of Simon of Cyrene. The sixth station is in the crypt of a Greek Catholic church. The seventh station is at a small Franciscan chapel on the street known as the *Suq;* this chapel is ordinarily open only for this procession. The eighth station is at the Greek Orthodox Monastery of St. Charalampos. The ninth station is on the roof of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, at the door of the Coptic Monastery of St. Antony. The tenth and eleventh stations are up one flight in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, in the Latin Chapel of Calvary. The twelfth station is at the altar of a small Greek Orthodox chapel at the left of the Latin chapel. The thirteenth station is at a small altar between the Greek and Latin chapels. The fourteenth station is at the Holy Sepulchre, on the ground floor of the church.

In Nazareth are shown the childhood home of Jesus and the carpenter shop where he worked, which, however, represent no reliable tradition. Even the exact site of Capernaum, where Jesus spent much of his later life, is uncertain. It may be Tell Hum, the site commonly favored, or it may be some other place in that vicinity. The remains of an old synagogue at Tell Hum, thought by many to belong to the time of Christ, are probably of the third century A.D.

We are thus reminded that Christianity is a spiritual religion, and does not depend upon the exact identification of places and objects.

There are some curious traditions in Palestine, which doubtless many do not believe. In a side chapel of the Armenian Cathedral of Saint James, in a niche by the side of the steps leading up to the altar, are three rough stones, each protected by a wire grating, which are evidently highly regarded, as they show evidence of much kissing by worshippers. (A round opening in each wire grating makes such kissing possible.) One story told about them is this. When Jesus said: "I tell you that, if these shall hold their peace, the stones will cry out" (Luke 19:40), these three stones cried out.

The Monastery of the Cross, a Greek monastery, in the outskirts

of Jerusalem on the west, perpetuates another tradition. There are variant forms of this tradition. The most comprehensive one is that when Adam was banished from the Garden of Eden, he begged for something from the garden to take with him. He was given three seeds which, with wonderful foresight, he planted near Jerusalem. The three resulting stalks united into one stalk which later divided into three branches, ultimately becoming a large tree. In the time of Lot, this tree was in a languishing condition. Lot, as a penance for his sins, was told to bring water from the Jordan and water the tree. He started to do this, and on the way back from the Jordan he was accosted by a Russian (!) pilgrim who asked him for a drink and drank all the water in his skin bag. This happened a second and a third time. Then it was revealed to Lot by an angel that the pilgrim was actually the devil, seeking to prevent the accomplishment of Lot's purpose. Lot was told that his endeavors were accepted, and thereafter the tree flourished. Later the timber from the tree was used to build a bridge across the Kedron. When the Queen of Sheba visited Solomon she refused to cross the bridge and told Solomon that it was sacred. So Solomon took up the bridge and stored the timbers in a room in the temple. These timbers were used for the cross on which Jesus was crucified. The Convent of the Cross is built upon the supposed site of this tree. It has on the wall of the nave a picture of the tree.

On the ground floor of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is a small chapel called the Chapel of Adam. This belongs to the Greek Church, and adjoining it is a room used as the general office of the Greek Church. On one side of the Chapel of Adam is a capacious niche in the ledge which underlies Jerusalem, reached by a door from the chapel itself. Immediately above this Chapel of Adam is the small Greek chapel which is the traditional site of the crucifixion, the twelfth station of the cross. This upper chapel has three small openings in the floor where the three crosses are said to have stood. Beneath the chapel is the underlying ledge which here has a cleft in it. A Greek monk told me the story that at the time of the crucifixion the body of Adam was in the niche by the side of the Chapel of Adam, and the blood of Jesus trickled down through the cleft upon the skull of Adam, thus cleansing him from sin. At the end of the story the monk said, rather sadly, "I don't know where the body of Adam is now."

To the ordinary tourist Palestine is not an attractive country. Those who spend but a few days there, after the ordinary manner of tourists, usually find its scenery disappointing. One who stays longer, however, modifies this judgment somewhat. The barren mountains have a certain

impressive grandeur. Even during the long dry summer there are subdued contrasts of color. The soil is reddish-brown, the limestone rocks are gray, the olive trees are a deep green, and the fig trees a lighter shade of green. In the spring, following the rains, many of the fields are covered with a brilliant array of wild flowers in bright colors, among which are conspicuous the scarlet anemone (lily of the field), the red poppy, and cyclamens in various colors.

After all is said, Palestine and its vicinity possess unique advantages for the biblical student. The Department of Antiquities is now occupying a million dollar building in Jerusalem, recently completed, where are housed many interesting and instructive objects pertaining to life in the times of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament. Jerash in Transjordan affords a remarkable opportunity for the study of early churches. Thirteen churches have been found there, the earliest being of the fourth century A.D.; eleven of these have been excavated. The American School of Oriental Research owns a commodious and comfortable building in Jerusalem where, in normal times, biblical students are welcome. One can find customs in Palestine which are very similar to those in the time of the New Testament, and even of the Old Testament. The Bible becomes more real when it is studied in the setting in which it was written.

THEOLOGY IN THE LIGHT OF PSYCHIATRIC EXPERIENCE

ANTON T. BOISEN
Chicago Theological Seminary

THE idea of God and the laws of the spiritual life are derivatives of the social nature of man. Such in brief is the thesis of this paper. I shall try to show that the idea of God is the symbol of that which is supreme in the individual and social system of loyalties and that explicity or implicitly it is operative in the lives of all men. It thus represents that fellowship with which man as a social being seeks identification and of which his system of values is merely a function. To feel oneself estranged from that fellowship is the essence of the sense of guilt, and constitutes the primary evil in the functional types of mental illness. Restoration to mental health (salvation) requires release from this sense of estrangement and reëstablishment of right relationship. In psychotherapeutic practice the needed forgiveness is mediated by the physician, and no results are achieved except as the patient comes to trust the physician. In those spontaneous cures known as "conversion experiences" there is characteristically the sense of being forgiven directly by God. Such experiences have a profound emotional effect which passes in an unbroken series from the mild mysticism of the recognized conversion experience to the turmoil of acute mental disorder. The emotional impact of the mystical experience is due to the shift in social reference which is involved in the changed concept of the self and the new role in a cosmic drama.

METHODOLOGY

The thesis proposed has been derived from twenty years' experience as a student of religion among the mentally ill. It will be considered in the light of a particular case. The use of a case has the following advantages:

1. It is an aid to clear thinking. It will enable us to proceed with some assurance that we are talking about the same things without waiting to agree on definitions.

2. It introduces us at once to the primary sources for the understanding of human nature.

3. It lends itself to the pooling of insights on the part of different specialized workers.

The case which we are using has been selected out of a large number as a *type*. By that is meant a case which presents a certain constellation

of tendencies which statistical studies have shown to be related and which moreover presents them freed so far as possible from complicating features. The basis on which this particular case was chosen is a certain set of ideas and attitudes. This patient gave unusually striking expression to a group of ideas which we have found to be characteristic of the acute functional disorders. He was, moreover, unusually free from the malignant attitudes of suspicion and hostility and from overt eroticism. It will therefore serve admirably to raise the problem of the relationship of the mystical and of the pathological.

THE TEST: A CASE RECORD

The patient chosen for consideration was brought to the hospital because of an attempt at suicide. He had been found in his home with the gas turned on and both wrists cut. According to the commitment papers the motive was self-sacrifice. He wanted to relieve the world of its sins. The onset of the illness, according to the patient, was "quite long—it was a whole week!" The wife states that she had not noticed anything out of the way until two days before. There had been a previous commitment thirteen years back. Then also the onset had been sudden, the disturbance severe, and the duration brief.

In appearance he was a short, stocky man of fifty-three with barrel chest and heavy muscles. When first seen, the disturbed condition had already passed. For one who had just emerged from so searching an ordeal he showed a surprising degree of quiet self-assurance. He talked frankly of his experience in a sensible and matter-of-fact manner. There was no hesitation and no push of speech.

According to his account he was of good middle-class Swedish stock and was second in a family of nine, of whom seven were boys. All of the children lived to maturity and have given good accounts of themselves. The father as a young man had served several years as steward on a sailing vessel. After he was married he was employed in a flour mill. The patient describes him as a home-loving man who together with the mother became quite religious in their later years. He, however, from his fourth to his twelfth year had lived in his grandmother's home.

He considers himself to have been a fairly normal boy. He went through seven grades of school. He did not repeat any grades, but his scholastic standing was only fair and he hated school. In a fight, however, he was not so dumb. He could lick any boy in his room. After leaving school he served an apprenticeship; then at the age of twenty-one he went to sea. After seven years of roving he settled down in the United States and at the age of thirty-one he married. His vocational record

is good. He had no difficulty in holding jobs and made good wages, $66 a week being his regular scale. His trade, however, is a highly specialized one and jobs are scarce, those that do come being portioned out by the Union. For this reason he has been idle a good part of the time.

Of his sex adjustments he talks frankly and without apparent attempts at concealment. There had been the usual difficulty with masturbation in the adolescent period, but he thinks it was not excessive. At least he had never worried over it. At sixteen a girl older than himself attempted to initiate him into the mysteries of sex but his response was unsatisfactory. There were no further hetero-sexual relationships until he went to sea. In this period he went with his mates to houses of prostitution in some of the ports they visited, but he never contracted any venereal disease and apparently he kept within the limits of respectability as judged by his particular group. His wife at the time he met her was working in a restaurant. He became interested in her and then discovered that she came from his native town in Sweden. According to him the marital adjustments have been happy on both sides. The wife also admits no irregularities. One gets the impression that the home is something of a matriarchy. The wife is a quick, attractive, business-like person, accustomed apparently to having her own way. She says of him, "He always says anything I say is all right." He says of himself that he has good will power and that whenever he wanted anything he did not hesitate to assert himself. One gets the impression, however, that he did not choose to assert himself very often.

The patient and his wife were both brought up in the Lutheran Church. Of his early training he says that his grandmother used to drag him off to church and Sunday school and that he hated it. He "never did grab anything in religion." He claims to be something of a free-thinker. In politics he inclines toward socialism. In religion he comes from Missouri. He wants proof before he is ready to believe. Neither he nor his wife has ever been active in the church.

According to his wife the first indication that anything was wrong was an increasing self-absorption and loss of sleep. She noticed this first on Friday. By Sunday he had become extremely agitated. He kept pacing the floor, moaning and lost in thought. When spoken to he was irritable, especially toward her. He asked her to go away and leave him alone. This she finally did. The suicidal attempt came during her absence. She explains the difficulty as due to lack of work. For three years he had worked only fourth time and for the past three months he had not worked more than ten days. Of course it was not his fault. He had to be content with what the Union assigned to him, but it meant that she

and the older daughter had been obliged to become the chief support of the home.

The patient was quite ready to tell of his experience and allowed me to get it down pretty much word for word. Here is his report:

I must give it to you in order. You can't understand unless we go back to the beginning thirteen years ago. You must know how the whole thing started, how I made a sort of bet with God. I was at a socialist meeting one night. A man there spoke of Jesus and of his giving his life for others. He asked if there were not many other men who would be willing to do that.

That night I was thinking about what the socialist speaker said and that I would gladly give my life for my family alone. In the night I was waked up and a voice said, "You must be put to the test to see if you will really give up your life." And it seemed as though God were right in front of me and the voice seemed to be God's voice and words from the Bible came into my head. I began to feel very nervous. It seemed as though something were getting into me. I did not tell my wife. I felt she would not understand. I got up and ran out in the street in my underwear. Of course that was a very strange thing to do, but it was just like the old Greek who found out how to weigh a ship. He was in his bathtub at the time the idea came to him and he got so excited that he jumped up and ran out without anything on. You get an idea so big it just carries you away. But a policeman brought me back and I slept until eight or nine o'clock in the morning.

I think it was the same night that blood came into my mouth and something said it took almost two thousand years to produce a man like me. I had lived for two thousand years. It was just like I had gone through many generations. Sometimes I was born rich and sometimes I was born poor. . . .

About a week after that I was sent to the hospital. After that dream I was nervous. I had a feeling like when they bind up your arm and give you a blood test. I was sort of filled up. It was a queer feeling—something you don't understand what it is. I had the feeling that there were two sides and that I had to go to one side or the other in order to get salvation. I was out in the park when it happened. I had my child on my arm and my wife was with me. I got up and started to go. I felt I had to. My wife, she looked at me and saw my eyes was bloodshot. She wanted me to go to the doctor, but I felt I would break my agreement with God if I did. Just then a policeman came along and my wife called him. He started to take the child away and I started to fight. Then other policemen came and they took me to the hospital.

In the hospital I was put in a strait-jacket. The first night I had a dream. I seemed to be crucified, and the whole room was full of devils. They were trying to hurt me, but I was full of power. You see I was in a delirium. I dreamed I was dead. I dreamed I was laying in the grave just like Jesus did.

In about three days my mind came back, and I was released at the end of three weeks. I got along very well after that. I had steady work and there was nothing to worry about. During the last three years work has been scarce and there has been plenty of time to think. No, I had not been thinking much about religion. My wife was told at the hospital that the trouble came from reading the Bible, so I put the Bible in the attic. I didn't want to make her nervous. And I didn't go to church.

This last attack began when something told me to go and get the Bible. I had started then to pray to God. I had been feeling lonesome and I had it in my mind that there is a God. Then it came to me that I had a second instalment to pay. I had to finish paying my bet with God. I came then into a state of fear. Something said to me, "Are you willing to commit suicide?" And it was just like I had to do it. I turned on the gas. That was for my wife. Then I slashed my wrists, one for one daughter and the other for the other daughter. But everything I have done before came to a good end and I have the feeling that this will too. I just felt that I had to do it to keep my promise. I have the feeling now that I am a new man. All this is over. I have done my part.

No, I didn't hear anything. It's just like when you sit and think. Something comes to you. Sometimes it comes quick just like something talks to you. I suppose it comes from God. I can't see any other explanation. Yes, it came from the best part of myself. I never got any messages from the devil, though one time something did say to me that the devil is a part of God.

Yes, I did say that when this came on it was just like I hypnotized myself. When I talk with a doctor I talk about self-hypnotizing. A doctor understand that. He don't understand about religion.

Did I think of myself as Christ? Yes, I guess I did. That was before I understand. You get happy and you wake up and think you are it. It's just like reading a story and missing the last part. You get puzzled as to who you are.

My plans? I want to get to work as soon as possible and get along the same as before. I don't want to take any more of them fits. When this thing came on, I thought I was going to have to preach, but the voice said, "You was going right the way you was. I don't need you to preach. I have other men I can send to do that.

At the staff meeting the patient made a very good impression. He told his story clearly and showed remarkable insight. He went into considerable detail but without any push of speech. His answers were always to the point. On one occasion, when he was asked if he did not consider his experience something unusual, he replied, "No it's just like eggs in an incubator. First one cracks and then another." On another occasion he was asked what he thought of when he saw the sun. He replied, "I think of God. It's one of the things that makes me think there must be a God. I really think the earth is like an incubator and the sun gives the heat. I got that idea in a dream."

POINTS TO NOTICE

1. *How the Disturbance Began*

The patient's own explanation of the onset was that he had an idea so big that it just carried him away. What that idea was is fairly clear. He thought that God was talking to him, that he was really a very different person from what he had supposed, and that he had a great responsibility resting upon him. Ideas of death, of rebirth, of previous

incarnation, and of mission were also present. We have then clearly exemplified in this case the entire constellation of ideas which have been found to be characteristic of the acute functional disorders.[1] In all such cases the actual disorder seems to begin, just as in this case, with an experience interpreted as a manifestation of the superhuman.

2. *Nature's Power to Heal*

This case would be recognized by most psychiatrists as one that had a favorable prognosis. The onset was very sudden, the disturbance acute, and the attitudes free from such malignant tendencies as suspicion, hostility, and overt sexuality. According to my view, disorders of this type are not evils but attempts at re-organization, analogous to fever or inflammation in the body. They are manifestations of nature's power to heal, and, as such, they are closely related to those spontaneous constructive solutions of inner conflicts which we know as "conversions."[2]

3. *The Mystical and the Pathological*

Experiences such as that of our patient serve to dramatize life. They reveal problems which are present in ordinary life but which in ordinary life do not carry enough emotional charge to lift them into the field of attention. Under ordinary conditions the individual is busy with his customary pursuits, and his reflections on matters philosophical and religious are generally in terms of an accepted currency of ideas. He therefore indulges in a lot of mere verbalization. In time of crisis, however, he is confronted with the ultimate issues of life. Who am I? What is this world in which I live? What am I in this world for? Where am I now? How far have I succeeded or failed? are questions which become fraught with meaning. The individual feels himself face to face with reality. Philosophy and theology are no mere matters of academic concern but of life and death. Under such conditions meaning and emotion outstrip symbol. Instead of beginning with words and concepts one must seek words to express the new meanings which come thronging in. Under intense emotion the mind is stirred in ever-widening circles and at deeper levels. Ideas then come flooding in as from an outside source. The tendency is to attribute them to a divine or to a demonic origin. Such experiences may serve to give new life and meaning to traditions and concepts which before had been dry and meaningless. They may open the eyes to a larger universe and bring insights which are new and creative. Sometimes they result in a break with the past and

[1] Boisen, *Exploration of the Inner World*, Chicago, Willett, Clark & Co., 1936, chap. I.
[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 53 ff.; also chap. II.

with its particular culture patterns. Not infrequently they are definitely destructive, shattering the accepted foundations of judgment and reasoning. In any case they spring out of strong emotion and they produce intense emotion of terror or of joy. We may class them as *mystical* experiences in so far as they give the sense of identification with the larger fellowship represented by the idea of God. Such a sense of identification with God is common in mental disorder as well as in religious experience. Pathological features tend to appear in proportion as the experience is solitary, as it comes in the nature of a sudden release from the pressure of accumulated difficulties, when it is preceded by a prolonged period of dryness and sense of deprivation, and when there is a sense of condemnation by God or of danger from a hostile source.

4. *The Idea of God*

It is clear that our patient's two disturbed periods began with the idea that God was talking to him. The conditions leading up to this idea are, however, not clear in either of the two periods. We know that he had not been addicted to churchgoing and that at other times he had never shown any particular interest in religion. On the basis of our observation of other cases we can say that it is not necessary to find an explanation in terms of previous indoctrination but that ideas concerning the superhuman tend to appear spontaneously whenever an individual becomes absorbed in a problem which vitally affects his personal destiny. Under intense concentration and strong emotion the mental processes are quickened. Ideas darting into the mind then become so vivid that they are interpreted as coming from an outside source and are attributed to God or to the devil in accordance with the value judgments involved.

Such experiences always produce a profound emotional effect and, as in this case, may so upset the accepted norms of judgment and reasoning that mental disorder results. Where, as under certain types of religious influence, the experience takes place within a social matrix and follows certain accepted social patterns, and where God is thought of as approving, the result may be an accession of power.[3] Where, on the other hand, the experience takes place in isolation, especially where it involves the sense of condemnation and fear, the result is likely to be mental disorder. The present case was that of an isolated experience and involved ideas of death and world change. The sense of guilt and condemnation is not so clear. The profound emotional impact is to be

[3] Boisen, "Economic Distress and Religious Experience," *Psychiatry*, II, No. 2 (May, 1939).

explained by the shift in social reference and by the changed concept of the self.

The significance of the experience of feeling oneself face to face with God may be considered in the light of Mead's theory of the social basis of the personality.[4] According to that theory the personality is merely the subjective aspect of culture. It is the internalization within the individual of the organized social attitudes made possible through the use of language. Herein lies the difference between human social organization and that of the lower animals. In the case of ants and bees, for example, we have a complex and highly developed social organization, but its basis is physiological (instinctive). The individual members of the beehive and of the anthill coöperate because of the way they are built. Reproduction is taken care of by one individual, the queen, with her enormously overdeveloped sex organs. The fighting is done by a group of soldiers who are good for nothing else. Another group takes care of the food-getting, the housing, and the care of the young. All coöperate automatically, and, if they need any special tool, such as flying apparatus, they grow it. In mammals we see another line of development, but even here the same distinction holds to some extent. Among all animals below man the sex drive is confined physiologically to certain rutting seasons. In man it is controlled by the *mores*. With the introduction of language the sex drive and other matters vital to the welfare of the race are governed by the internalization within the individual of the group attitudes. By means of language the individual is able to respond to certain common social symbols which call forth the same response in himself as they do in others. In this way he builds up within himself certain more or less consistent responses to these symbols, and the particular organization of social attitudes which is developed in him is his character. The individual's system of values thus depends upon the group which he reflects or represents. His standards of value are, in other words, functions of his social relationships, particularly to those with whom he identifies himself.

A consequence of this view, which Mead did not develop but which seems to follow, is that the idea of God is the symbol under which loyalty to the group is raised to the level of the universal and abiding. It stands for that in his social experience which the individual most admires and loves, that to which he gives his allegiance and by which he judges himself. It represents, thus, a reality of vital importance to every living man whether he calls himself religious or not. To feel

[4] G. H. Mead, *Mind, Self and Society*, University of Chicago Press, 1934.

oneself brought face to face with God is, then, the experience of being brought into that fellowship which is for the individual all-important. And inasmuch as the entire personality is a social product and a reflection of a particular social group, the experience of feeling oneself identified with a superior fellowship means inevitably a new concept of the self. Moreover, the accepted standards and values no longer apply, because the individual has found that which seems to him infinitely greater.

5. *Spiritual Maturity and the Sovereignty of God*

In our consideration of this case we have been interested primarily in those aspects of our patient's experience which are typical and we have disregarded the particular personal problems with which he was grappling. We may, however, at this point call attention to what seems to be the centre of his personal problem. The key to that problem may be found in the beginning of his first disturbed period. He had gone to a socialist meeting, and the speaker asked if there were not other men beside Jesus who were willing to give their lives for others. That night, he tells us, he kept thinking about what the socialist speaker had said, and the question came to him, "Would you be willing to give your life for your wife and family?" And it came to him that he must be put to the test. We must, of course, be careful not to draw too many inferences from the immediate occasion of a disturbance. We know that especially in the acute disorders we have to do with an accumulation of inner stresses and that the upsetting experience may be the merest touch. Nonetheless we may assume that the upsetting factor must have some relationship to the central problem. We notice, therefore, that the question with which the disturbance began had to do with this man's relationship to his wife and family. Examining his story from this standpoint, what do we find? The picture seems fairly clear. Here was a reasonably steady, self-reliant individual who after serving his apprenticeship as a mechanic goes to sea. There are in this period some irregularities. At some of the ports he goes with his comrades to houses of prostitution, but these indulgences do not seem to have gone beyond the bounds of respectability as judged by his group. After several years of wandering he married a young woman from his native town in Sweden whom he meets in this country, an attractive person of considerable force of character. With his marriage his entire manner of life is changed. He becomes now a devoted husband and father. His evenings are spent at home, or at least in company with his wife and daughters. Aside from his labor union he belongs to no organizations. It is therefore clear that his wife was now supreme in his system of loyalties. His entire

life was built around her, and his love for her was for him the equivalent of a religion. There is in this nothing unusual. Sex love, as Professor Hocking points out,[5] is closely associated with religion; not that religion can be explained in terms of sex, but that sex love at its best approaches religion. Both seek somewhat the same thing—union with the idealized other-than-self. But it is also true that sex love seeks something beyond the finite love object and that it cannot be satisfied with the finite. It seems fair to assume that this law was operative in the case of this simple mechanic. It was not for him sufficient to have reorganized his life around his love for his wife. He had undoubtedly, after the manner of lovers, sworn to his readiness to give up everything for her sake; and his picture of himself was that of a devoted husband and father. But the actualities would sometimes become a bit trying. As a rugged, self-reliant male he found it not always easy to submit to her domination, and he probably became uncomfortably aware of attitudes within himself which were at variance with the undying devotion which he professed. The problem of his ultimate loyalty was thus pressing heavily upon him. We may therefore hazard the guess that the source of strain in this case was not so much the sense of guilt as the need of achieving a higher level of adjustment, the level represented by the psychoanalytic doctrine of autonomy and the Christian doctrine of the sovereignty of God.

At first thought these two doctrines may seem opposed one to the other. We submit, however, the proposition that they are really contributory to each other. Modern psychiatric experience tends to support the old Christian doctrine and to throw new light upon it. But ancient religious insight sees deeper. It recognizes the principle of autonomy. At the same time it recognizes the fact that no individual can be self-sufficient and it finds the solution in the idea of the sovereignty of God. By this is meant that true autonomy is achieved through finding one's role as a child of God and taking one's place in the larger universe. One's loyalty must thus be transferred from the finite to the infinite. Such dependence upon God is entirely consonant with self-reliance in that it makes the individual independent of the trials and vicissitudes of his temporal existence.

6. *The Concept of the Self*

With the idea that God was talking to him there came to our patient a new concept of himself. He was more important than he had ever before dreamed. It had taken two thousand years to produce a man like

[5] *Human Nature and Its Remaking*, Yale University Press, 1923, chap. 42.

him. He had appeared in many forms. Sometimes he had been born rich. Sometimes he had been born poor. Questioning revealed that like many another acutely disturbed patient he had identified himself with Christ. This question of who one is appears characteristically in the acute psychoses. The disruption of the accepted idea of one's role in life is undoubtedly a factor of fundamental importance in the causation of the disturbance.

This confusion regarding one's identity as a factor in the acute psychoses gives support to the view that the concept of the self is the nucleus of the personality. The growth of the personality is thus dependent upon the discovery of relationships to some particular idea of ourselves and of our role. A fundamental change in the idea of the self therefore compels a thoroughgoing reorganization of the personality. We may furthermore suggest that this man's identification of himself with Christ, fantastic though it seems at first thought, is probably related to Paul's doctrine of the "indwelling Christ" and to Jesus' teaching regarding the fatherhood of God. The enlarged concept of the self is one of the eternally valid insights of religion. So also is its recognition of the individual's insignificance. It is characteristic of religion that it extends the horizon in both directions. Religion rejoices both in the microscope and in the telescope. Our patient's fantastic idea of himself is thus not without an element of truth.

7. *The Problem of Sin and Salvation*

The fact that our patient had no evident sense of guilt is unusual. It is possible that a sense of estrangement and condemnation had been present in the earlier stages of his two periods of disorder. We must not forget that on both occasions he came under observation only after God had spoken to him and he may already have had the feeling of being forgiven. It is therefore in order to point out that the functional mental disorders are rooted commonly in a sense of sin or guilt due to the presence of masses of experience and dynamic action patterns which the individual is neither able to control nor to acknowledge for fear of condemnation. The sense of guilt is thus the social judgment which the individual pronounces upon himself on the basis of the ethical standards which he has accepted as his own. But the standards themselves are merely functions of the social relationships to those with whom he wishes to be identified. The essence of the sense of guilt is therefore not so much the transgression of a code as the breach of trust which is involved. It is thus primarily a matter of social relationships, and salvation, or cure, consists in release from the sense of estrangement

and restoration to the fellowship of the good, that fellowship which is symbolized by the idea of God.

Very striking in this case are the ideas of death and of rebirth. The test to which this patient felt himself subjected had to do with his willingness to give his life for others. This was true of both disturbed periods. Associated with this was the idea that he had lived in many previous incarnations. Ideas of death are characteristic of the acute disturbances generally and ideas of rebirth are frequent. There are those who hold that the idea of death such as we see in this case is an expression of the wish for rebirth and that in any case ideas of death and of renewal are closely associated.

Mental disorder of this type, together with the conversion experience to which it is closely related, exemplifies an important therapeutic principle. What it seeks is complete commitment to that which is supreme in the individual's hierarchy of loyalties. It is the desperate attempt in the face of an accumulation of difficulties to get rid of all that is alien to the accepted ideals and thus to make possible the needed reorganization or rebirth. From this standpoint the ideas of death and rebirth which recur so frequently are by no means accidental. They represent the exact meaning of the experience as a manifestation of nature's power to heal. This requirement of complete commitment, even to the point of self-sacrifice is the essence of Jesus' doctrine of the cross. Jesus proclaimed repeatedly, in words whose meaning seems perfectly clear, that no man could be his disciple unless he was willing to give up all that he had and follow him. To Jesus himself the idea of his death clearly represented the last full measure of devotion to the Love that ruled the universe. It was his declaration of the principle that the redemption of the many is to be brought about through the sacrificial devotion of the few, and it summoned men to enlist in that sacrificial task. It was, furthermore, his proclamation of the good news that in such devotion, rather than in conventional morality and success, lay the way of salvation. It represented thus a shift from a static to a dynamic morality which finds the good life not in outward correctness but in self-forgetful devotion to the best. To the man overwhelmed by his sins it brought thus the offer of a new chance. This same principle was central in Paul's gospel of deliverance.

It is a sad reflection upon the frailty of human nature that Jesus' own teaching regarding his death has been so largely misconstrued. Instead of a summons to the sacrificial way of life it has become the doctrine of a vicarious atonement, according to which, as commonly interpreted, Jesus gave his life to satisfy the demands of justice and

thereby paid the price which enables those who believe in him to obtain salvation in a life hereafter. His commanding challenge to a life of adventurous devotion has thus all too often become just another means of evasion.

Psychoanalytic literature today has much to say about neurotic self-punishment. Alexander, for example, regards it as the "counterfeit coinage" by which unacceptable cravings are permitted to buy indulgence. This, he holds, comes about through the axiomatic assumption that by means of punishment and suffering one achieves not only absolution from sin but a justification for committing it.[6] According to my view neurotic self-punishment stands for a valid principle. The difficulty is that most mental sufferers have not been able to pay the full price but have resorted to various compromises and concealment devices. That our patient is now at home and apparently in good condition may be explained by the fact that he did stand the test.

8. *Organized Religion*

Our patient had the idea that he was going to have to preach, but a voice said to him, "You was going right the way you was. I don't need you to preach. I have other men whom I can send." The orders from above are not always so sensible among our acutely disturbed patients. The prophetic call is common among them. But however misguided it may be in particular cases, it stands nonetheless for a principle of fundamental importance. It seems to be of the very essence of religion that it must express itself socially. Religion has to do with the on-going process of the perpetuation and improvement of the race and with the establishing and making effective of loyalties that are universal. The prophetic call stands also for the principle that the new insights and the new vision which come through the crisis experiences of life must be made effective in the work-a-day world long after the emotional glow has passed. This is true both individually and socially. Institutionalization is thus part of the process by which moral achievements are passed on from one generation to another.

This patient after he had recovered from his first attack was told that the difficulty came from being too religious. He therefore put his Bible up in the attic. He thus side-stepped the problem with which he had been faced and later on he found that he had another "instalment" to pay. Just what he has done with his Bible since the last disturbance I do not know. He has now been for more than eight years outside the

[6] Franz Alexander, *Psychoanalysis of the Total Personality*, Washington, Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co., 1930, p. 94.

hospital, free apparently from further trouble. The outlook for the future seems most hopeful. We should, however, feel somewhat better satisfied if we knew that he were now consulting his Bible and if he belonged to some organized group which was helping to keep alive in him the very real insights which came to him through his disturbed periods.

SOME GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Generalizations derived from this and many other cases of mental illness during the past twenty years may be summarized as follows:

1. *Conscience* is not the rigid "super-ego" of the Freudians, which needs to be broken up or eradicated like a vermiform appendix, but the subjective aspect of culture; the internalization within the individual of the social organization which enables him to direct his own life without external compulsion. It is the artistic sense applied to the field of social living which lies on the growing edge of human nature and tells the individual of his success or failure in maintaining his status and his growth.[7]

2. *Moral Standards* do not exist in a vacuum but are a function of our social relationships, particularly to those whom we count most worthy of love and honor.

3. *Religion* is not a means of escape from reality, but even in its cruder forms it is an attempt at orientation with reference to the ultimate issues of life which manifests itself spontaneously whenever those issues come to the fore. It is not a system of beliefs and values but the sense of fellowship raised to the level of the universal and abiding, with the idea of God as the symbol of that which is supreme in the hierarchy of loyalties.

4. *Sin* or *Guilt* is not so much infraction of moral law as breach of trust as regards the ultimate loyalties. The essential evil, which is seen strikingly in functional mental illness, is the sense of estrangement and isolation resulting from the presence in one's life of that which one is afraid to tell for fear of condemnation.

5. *Repentance* is not an evil, even in its more morbid forms, but exactly what Christian theology has always held, the first step in the process of salvation. Emotional disturbances, even to the point of serious disorder, are frequently manifestations of nature's power to heal. Such types should be sharply distinguished from those which represent the end results of character difficulties. This distinction, now seldom made even by our best psychiatrists, is all-important in any understanding of mental illness in its relation to religious experience.

[7] W. E. Hocking, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

6. *Salvation, Cure,* or *Mental Health* is not dependent upon modification of the standards but upon reëstablishment of right relationship with that which is supreme in the individual's system of loyalties. A breach of trust must be followed by the experience of reconciliation marked on the one side by acknowledgment of wrongdoing and on the other by the capacity to understand and the willingness to resume friendly relations.

7. *The Sovereignty of God* is not just an idea carried over from a monarchical period or a demand for weak submission to constituted authority, but the recognition that true maturity and autonomy on the part of the individual is achieved through the transfer of loyalty from the finite to the infinite and the progressive adjustment of his personal life to the moral order of the universe. Dependence upon God thus becomes a source of comfort and strength which makes the individual independent of the changes and dangers of life.

From Off the Campus and On

Readers will find in the six articles in this issue of the Crozer Quarterly considerable diversity in subject and point of view. Each article is written by a specialist who has faithfully lived up to the one editorial requirement—"authoritative and interesting." Though each author is well-known in the world of scholars, several of them have not previously appeared in our pages.

Dr. Matthews will need no introduction to our readers. Ever since the Crozer Quarterly was established book reviews and occasional articles from his pen have made valued contributions. His article in this issue, "The Old Testament Prophet in his Background," was the matriculation address at the opening of the academic year. Since 1920 he has been professor of Old Testament at Crozer. His various books make him known far beyond the confines of the Crozer campus. His most recent volume, a commentary on Ezekiel, which is receiving wide acclaim, is reviewed in this issue.

For more than thirty years Conrad Henry Moehlman has been a member of the faculty of the Rochester Theological Seminary, now the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. He is an indefatigable worker, as the long list of his books and articles attests. In the present article, "To End the Universal Christian Schism," he clashes swords with Charles Clayton Morrison, for many years editor of the *Christian Century*. Dr. Moehlman feels that there is another side of the picture besides that presented in *What Is Christianity?* and does not hesitate to draw attention to it. We are sure his article will have a wide reading.

It is with particular pleasure that we welcome to our pages Father McGarry, editor of the newly established Catholic journal, *Theological Studies*. At the recent bicentennial celebration of the University of Pennsylvania he was one of the distinguished scholars invited to address the conference on religion. For seven years he was a member of the faculty of Weston College in Massachusetts, first as professor of New Testament, later as professor of dogmatic theology. Following his years at Weston he was president of Boston College. He holds the degree of S.T.D. from Woodstock College and S.S.L. from the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. His article, "Freedom in Catholic Theological Thought," should prove highly interesting and informative. One of the greatest hindrances to Christian fellowship and understanding is ignorance, especially ignorance of what our brethren in different communions are

doing. Father McGarry has very graciously enabled us to get a first-hand view.

The brief article, "Speaking of Challenges," will be read and re-read by the thoughtful minister. Dr. Newell's own informal words—which he had no idea would be printed—will introduce him to our readers: ". . . . I am a Massachusetts Yankee, born and educated in the Connecticut Valley, having my college degree from Amherst and my Bachelor of Divinity from Hartford Seminary. I did not expect to enter the ministry when in college, and consequently the period between college and seminary was spent in business and teaching—the former giving me personal contact with men which has been even a better preparation for the active pastorate than the academic courses. My pastoral service has covered only two real pastorates—Middlebury, Vt., and the parish here in Harwich. . . . . Fifteen years of my work have been with Piedmont College in Demorest, Ga., where I served in various capacities, sometimes teaching, sometimes raising money, and 1930-1936 as president of that institution. Not at all a sensational career, as you will note, but one giving much opportunity to meet young people. In the course of the years Piedmont College rewarded me with the Doctor of Divinity." We hope that this article, solicited by the editor, a member of Dr. Newell's summer congregation, will not be his last in our pages.

George Ricker Berry is too well-known to theological students and ministers to require much introduction. His long service as professor of Old Testament and Semitic languages in Colgate University and later, until his recent retirement, in the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School marked him as a distinguished and clear-cut scholar. His frequent visits in Palestine, on one of which he was annual professor in the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, together with his innate common sense make him singularly fitted to write upon Palestine—what it is and what it is not.

The concluding article will repay careful reading. Few men are more competent to tread the thorny paths of psychiatry than is Anton T. Boisen. For over thirteen years he was chaplain and supervisor of training in two state hospitals—Worcester, Mass., and Elgin, Ill. Since 1925 he has been lecturer and research associate in the Chicago Theological Seminary. The present article, "Theology in the Light of Psychiatric Experience," is thus not the product of an ill-trained and enthusiastic clerical novice, but the authoritative statement of an expert who knows what he is talking about. It was delivered in New York at the tenth annual conference of the Council for the Clinical Training of Theological Students in November, 1939. As the movement for such training would

seem to be increasing in our seminaries, it is with great satisfaction that we introduce to our readers one of its founders.

In addition to members of the Crozer faculty who, as usual, bear the brunt of the reviewing we welcome to our pages reviews from four others. Principal William C. Graham, United College, Winnipeg, in addition to his administrative duties is a distinguished Old Testament scholar; the Reverend Robert E. Keighton is minister of the (Baptist) Church of the Evangel, Narberth, Penna., and a former instructor in English and public speaking at Crozer; Dr. Ray H. Abrams is on the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania in the department of sociology; Dr. Charles H. Sears is general secretary of the New York City Society. While most of the reviews will continue to be written by members of the Crozer faculty, we are always glad to have reviews from competent scholars from off the campus.

BOOK REVIEWS

An American Commentary on the Old Testament: Ezekiel, by I. G. Matthews, Philadelphia, American Baptist Publication Society, 1939, pp. lvii, 189, $3.00.

Those who have followed the several volumes of this commentary as they have emerged from the press have already learned to expect work of a high order from Professor Matthews. In this present volume they will not be disappointed. It gives evidence on every page of the careful preparation, by the patient and exhaustive study of the literature on the subject, for which he is noted. At the same time the work is refreshingly free from any suggestion of mere pedantry. The trees have been carefully noted, but the woods have not been overlooked.

The introductory pages will be very useful—in particular the long section on the analysis of the book—for college teachers and students of the Old Testament. The section on the history of criticism is very succinct, but, in the case of a book like this where the problems of special introduction are so difficult, it is not altogether adequate as a guide for the appraisal of the worth of the various solutions proposed. As Professor Matthews points out, it is only in comparatively recent times that any serious attack has been leveled against the traditional view that the date, authorship, and place of origin of the book as represented in the text may be accepted. On the whole it is clear that Professor Matthews draws back in many important respects from the conclusions of such scholars as Hermann, Hölscher, Smith, Torrey, and Herntrich. But in dealing with their work he is content to stress those elements of it which he regards as valuable and to say little about other aspects of it. This undoubtedly is good manners, but it does not give the reader due opportunity to pass an informed judgment on the worth of the work of these literary critics as a whole. Doubtless Professor Matthews was conditioned in this regard by lack of space, but his contribution would have been rendered more valuable if he had set forth more fully his differences with some of these writers and had given the reasons for them.

The failure to do this results, so far as the present reviewer is concerned, in an unconvincing presentation of Professor Matthews' own rather moderate view of Ezekiel and his book. He solves the difficulties of the book by making it, in the main, the product of a prophet living in Palestine, possibly in the north, and of a disciple of the prophet living in Babylonia during the exile. This enables him to avoid, to a certain extent, dealing with the problem of Ezekiel's personality and to throw out some of the distasteful views of certain extremists on that subject. But the approach is so purely literary-critical as to leave the impression that the central problem of the book has been simplified by a critical device. From this difficulties result which make the positions of Professor Matthews unconvincing alike to those who hold radical and conservative views about the problems of special introduction to this book. If, for example, the story of Ezekiel's call is written by a genuine disciple, one must assume his sincerity in reporting a spiritual experience of his master. Yet if one does assume this, then, at this point and throughout the book, there remains nothing but evidence which might be otherwise explained for positing at all the editorial activity of such a disciple.

The state of the text of Ezekiel alone makes it clear that the book has accumulated a good many accretions. But, making due allowance for these, it is, in the

present reviewer's judgment at least, still far from proven that the traditional view of the date, authorship, and unity of the book must, in their essentials, be abandoned.

WILLIAM C. GRAHAM

The Other Side of the Jordan, by Nelson Glueck, New Haven, American Schools of Research, 1940, pp. xvii, 208, $2.50.

In this volume we have a nontechnical sketch of the results of the archæological work that has been carried on during the last eight years on "the other side of the Jordan." The six chapters are the result of a series of lectures delivered a year ago by the author in various educational institutions in the United States. For some eight years Dr. Glueck has spent most of his time in Palestine. For the last five he has been the highly esteemed director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, and during the last three he has conducted three intensive campaigns in the region north of the Red Sea. The result of Glueck's activities is that we have now reliable information concerning phases of history in Transjordania that hitherto were most indefinite, and where tradition had talked in generalities we now have the completest details.

Light has been thrown on three great civilizations. The earliest one existed between 2100 and 1900 B.C., and its frontier cities, facing the desert, from Mafraq, through Hallbat, Azraq, Tuba, and Bayir to Kilwa, have yielded to the spade the witness of ancient strength (p. 9). This petty empire of ancient days is often related to the Amorite invasion.

The second important period of development lies between 1250 and 600 B.C., which closely parallels the days of the Hebrew monarchy. Between these two, that is, from 1900 to 1250, there is no evidence of any extended sedentary occupation of these lands. This lacuna provides a serious problem for the student of early Old Testament history. There is, however, rich reward for the student of the later history in the material brought to light in Edom, Moab, Gilead, and Aquabah.

The third civilization on which grateful light has been thrown is that of the Nabatean, which flourished from the late pre-Christian centuries until its overthrow by Rome (pp. 158-200). These people of whom so little has hitherto been known now promise to bulk large in future history. Glueck has opened the door and we hope he may some day bring further treasure to light.

But of special interest to all is the addition to our knowledge of the period of Solomon that this author has made. The evidence of copper mines in the Arabah, with slag heaps and small roasting ovens near by, together with the amazingly complete blast furnace at Ezion-Geber provides one of the romances of archæology. Ezion-Geber has now been definitely located and its significance revealed. Rightly, this ancient village, with probably a population of a couple of hundred, has become the Pittsburgh of the Ancient East, or even better the Singapore of Solomon. Also "Solomon's wisdom" has taken on a new significance, and he has become a worthy forerunner of modern copper kings (pp. 93-109). To say more would spoil the story. Those interested in ancient history, in shipbuilding, in mining, in blast furnaces, in archæology, or in the Bible will find this a fascinating volume. It is amply illustrated, having 127 figures; it is racily written, with sufficient of the personal to provide human interest, and the constant reference to the Scriptures links the unknown to the well known. The opening chapter, "What Is Biblical Archæology?" is a fitting introduction to the general theme.

Professor Glueck, who left Palestine in June, 1940, to return to this country to resume his work as professor of archæology in Hebrew Union College, has provided a readable story of the results of his archæological work for those who have not followed his monthly reports in the *Bulletins* of the American Schools of Oriental Research, or the more technical presentations in the *Annuals* of the same schools. The layman or pastor who neglects to read this volume will, in some areas at least, be quite out of date.

I. G. MATTHEWS

The Gospel of the Kingdom, by Frederick C. Grant, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. xvii, 204, $2.00.

Readers will differ radically in their judgment of this volume, the contents of which were lectures given last February at Oberlin. Probably all readers will feel it wrong, perhaps very wrong, in spots; but they will by no means agree as to what the spots are. Those who see thoroughgoing eschatology through modern eyes and who wince at the thought that Jesus could ever have believed in such "rubbish," especially since it was never realized, will rejoice in Professor Grant and may even think that the walls of this modern Jericho have fallen before the trumpet blasts of the modern Joshua; but their joy will be turned to ashes as they ponder the implications of such a statement as, "But was the Kingdom of God an eschatological entity, as Matthew certainly assumed and as much of the apostolic preaching took for granted? Or has this emphasis and interpretation been read back into the teaching of Jesus, either by modern exegetes or by the writers of the gospels?" They may rejoice in seeing Jesus represented as a thoroughly religious man, in whose view the kingdom was entirely "this-worldly," was to be realized upon the soil of Palestine, and would provide social redemption; but their complacency may be shocked when they realize that this kingdom (*i. e.,* kingship) "belonged solely to God. There was no room for a messianic king; and to claim kingship for any human being, for example for himself, would have been to deny the central emphasis in all his teachings, viz., the direct, immediate control of the universe and of every event and incident in it by God himself with his unlimited power, love, and mercy." They will agree with Dr. Grant that this *is* a hard saying, especially when he proceeds further to demolish some more prized Christology: not only Jesus did not make messianic claims for himself, but did not identify himself as either the "son of man" of Enoch or the "suffering servant." Nor will all find any noticeable softening of it in the pious, if somewhat vague, assurances that he was "unique," "divine," that his gospel was "timeless, an 'eternal gospel,'" and that he speaks "'over the heads of his contemporaries' to all generations of men, in all races, in all ages," and "may still be worshipped," for they will wonder just how one who "was an *ancient* Jewish teacher" about whom "there was no suggestion of modernity" could achieve all this.

My chief criticism of the book, however, is not of any particular view or point. Although I totally disagree as to Jesus having a "this-worldly" view of the kingdom, which I think leaves far more serious questions unanswered than it answers, I find myself in agreement with so many of his contentions and applaud so many of his insights—for example, with regard to John the Baptist and what he did *not* proclaim, or the clear and businesslike way in which he questions the hallowed equation, "Messiah=son of man"—that I can forgive his perhaps un-Jovian heat and too sweeping denials. My chief criticism is not easily expressed and may be unfair, since Dr. Grant is by no means the chief sinner. It is to me the overconscious effort to give

a warm religious—"Christian"—flavor to his mercilessly critical study. It reminds me too much of the "painless" dentist who keeps assuring his helpless patient, suffering the tortures of the damned, that "it doesn't hurt much" and "how lovely the new plate will look." This is far too characteristic of a group of hitherto "liberal" theologians, who have just emerged from the foliage to discover that they have been climbing out the limb instead of up the tree, and who feel very self-conscious and unsteady at the end of the swaying branch. It may be natural, when caught in that position, to want protection from the rocks of the small boys on the ground beneath (but not too far beneath!) them—warm religious accents, frequent retreats, confessions that "climbing" is not all that it is cracked up to be may serve as such armor—to my mind, however, it is better to start climbing again, this time with a better sense of direction and with less talking. Professor Grant is far too good a scholar and has "climbed too high" to need or desire this sort of company. Probably the fact that the book is a series of lectures may account in part for the introduction of this element. Despite this stricture—and it must be repeated that Grant deserves it far less than do many others—the book is one which deserves, and will get, a wide reading. The candor, common sense, and insights which characterize this volume—save when he is too self-consciously "standing in the need of prayer"—make it a distinct and important contribution.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Greek Popular Religion, by Martin P. Nilsson, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. xviii, 166, $2.50.

In this small volume Professor Nilsson, an eminent Swedish scholar, long recognized as one of the truly great interpreters of Greek religion, has made a real and lasting contribution. In recent years the whole question of Greek religion has been turned upside down. We know now how wrong it was to identify Greek religion with Greek mythology (especially when the latter was seen through the eyes of the Alexandrian writers and Ovid) or even to start with the Homeric poems. The epoch-making discoveries in Mycenæ and Crete, especially the latter, opened an entirely new world. But despite that, there is bound to be the temptation to see Greek religion primarily through the eyes of the great literary figures—poets, tragedians, and philosophers—and to disregard the cruder and more primitive expressions of the common man who wrote no books and left few tangible remains. The great gods of Olympus and the great insights of Plato alike tend to blind us to the real quality of Greek religion.

This overemphasis Professor Nilsson has attempted to correct. To understand Greek religion we must know the religion of the common people, for the fate of all religion is determined by the masses. The great gods of Olympus were showy and glamorous, but they failed to exert a lasting influence. Christianity, for example, could and did sweep them aside with comparative ease; but the minor gods, the superstitions, the popular practices—these were more stubborn, and against them she was powerless, as the presence of countless practices and beliefs from the hoary past, still lusty today, all too clearly evidence. They corresponded to the deep-seated ideas and needs of mankind. To dismiss the beliefs in the myriads of spirits, dæmons, lesser gods, and heroes, who haunted the mountains and forests, who watched over the home, who protected the soil in which their bones were placed, is to miss the most permanent and influential element.

In fascinating style he treats of the countryside with its religion close to the

soil, the rural customs and festivals with their rich folklore and magical rites, the religion of the house and family, the changes and adaptations resulting from the rise of great cities and trades, the decline of some of the great gods, as Athene, who had become too exalted to be a goddess of common folk, and the introduction of new gods with whom the man in the street felt more at home, as Hecate from Caria and Bendis from Thrace and especially Asclepius. Perhaps the most important or telling contribution is found in the last chapter on "Seers and Oracles." Nilsson has never been afraid of being in a minority. Years ago he argued in an earlier work that the Mycenæans were Greeks, not conquerors from Minoan Crete, although to do so meant to run counter to weighty opposition. Today this view is shared by many. So it is no surprise to find him challenging the orthodox view that Greeks of the classical age were not superstitious. The evidence he presents, or, rather, the fresh appraisal of material well-known but curiously disregarded—the hankering after knowledge of the future, the naïve trust in omens and oracles, the oracle mongers and their shifty practices as they sought to act as the loyal legion of the old religion against the tirades of Sophists and the inroads of natural philosophy—appears to me unanswerable. Moreover the discussion is of profound significance not alone to the professional classicist but to the modern minister as he sees what happened in ancient Athens when religion attempted too dictatorially to tamper with and to manipulate politics and practical life.

His study of the religion of Eleusis is penetrating and rewarding. Here we have primarily the motif of the reuniting of the Corn Maiden with the Corn Mother. To understand this aright we must (1) recognize that Demeter was not the goddess of vegetation but of cereals, and (2) take into account the Greek climate. The time of separation is not (as in northern countries) in winter but in midsummer, the four months between June threshing and October sowing, when the ground is dry and barren. Then it is that the seed corn is brought up from the underground silos or jars—here we find the reason why Plouton, the god of wealth, becomes the god of the nether world—and sowed. Certainly this does give an easier explanation for the fact that the great rites were performed in the fall month (Bœdromion). The festival was one of joy, not of gloom; the reunion of the mother and daughter, not the latter's rape, was the primary note. It is tempting for those who know the modern Greek Easter to see a ready ground for comparison in spirit if in nothing else.

Here again we find one of the lasting contributions of the book—the tracing of survivals of the old in the life and thought of the present day. His discussion of the *pankarpia* or *panspermia,* an offering of mixed fruits, still to be seen in the celebration of the Greek All Souls' Day, and the actual use of utensils essentially similar to the old *kernos* existing in Minoan Crete give us pause.

It is safe to predict that this volume with its thirty-nine excellently chosen illustrations, will not be overlooked by students of the classical past. It will be a pity if it does not find its way into many a ministerial study.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Three Centuries of American Hymnody, by Henry Wilder Foote, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1940, pp. x, 418, $4.00.

1640–1940 is the period covered; in 1640 *The Bay Psalm Book* was published—the first songbook, and incidentally the first book of any kind to be printed in

America. Dr. Foote traces the long and devious trail, step by step, which leads from psalmody to hymnody with its burst of productivity in the nineteenth century. The volume is too encyclopedic to permit an adequate review, neither can a reviewer transfer to his readers the literary style and the manifest erudition which he finds in these pages. One may, however, intimate the scope and direction of the author's thought.

English-speaking colonists brought a heritage of psalm singing with them. Psalmody arose and flourished in the old country from the sixteenth century onward. For about a century and a quarter this form of church music was the predominant vocal manifestation of the worshiping groups in the churches. The Plymouth group brought Ainsworth's *Book of Psalms* with them, and from it sang on the Mayflower and in this colony up to 1692. But also the Puritans were people of song from the time of the printing of *The Bay Psalm Book* onward; this fact, certainly established by Dr. Foote, will surprise those who are accustomed to think of the Puritan as dour and hard and void of song. For one hundred years this *Bay Psalm Book* held sway without serious rival. The first organ imported came to Boston in 1711, and the first organ built in America was in Puritan Boston in 1746. These latter facts are intimations of an actual revival of singing, beginning about 1715.

In Chapter IV attention is given to the rise of new hymns and tunes, with special attention to the singing of the German settlers in Pennsylvania. These were a singing people, though their hymns influenced but little the development of hymnody in this country. The Mennonites and Moravians both had a contribution of no little significance to make to hymn singing in general, but there were forbidding conditions present.

One of the most interesting and significant sections of this volume consists of nearly fifty pages in which is traced the gradual transition, over a period of nearly one hundred years, from psalmody to hymnody. Dr. Watts, the Wesleys, and a host of others throng these pages.

During the early nineteenth century hymn production rises, reaching flood tide in about 1865, then levels off in a steady creation of some of the noblest of all church and patriotic hymns. Within this period the negro "spirituals," of high order, begin to come to recognition, and the evangelistic songs, of very low order, spread like a devastating fire.

Two chapters, "Hymns of the Twentieth Century" and "Retrospect and Prospect," complete the survey, while three full length indices make the volume not only very useful but indispensable to the student of the field of American hymnody.

W. R. MCNUTT

American Mirror, by Halford E. Luccock, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. vi, 300, $2.50.

All will know Dr. Luccock to be a professor of homiletics at Yale and the author of a number of inspired and inspiring volumes. *American Mirror* aims to help the reader and student get an image of the nineteen-thirties by looking into the literature of that decade as a mirror. The author says a perfect image is not reflected but a recognizable image at least can be discerned. The image is of a society, a humanity distraught and beating the air, keeping up a certain sound and fury; the reflection reminds one of a telephoto picture in the newspaper. Our

author's opening sentence, quoted from Connelly's *Green Pastures,* is happy, "Everything nailed down is comin' loose." Lesser angels have thought as much; only Gabriel was able to say it!

Eleven chapters describe the "mirror": "The Valley of the Shadow," wherein is discovered a sense of having lost the way, a sense of failure and futility, and a sneer of cynicism; "Some Literary Trends of the Nineteen-Thirties," among which are "life on relief," "cruising in a world of low visibility," "forty mile gales of opinion," "closeness of contact of literature and life," and at the same time "flight from reality," "emergence of hunger into literature," "movement from Freud to Marx," "the sense of waste"—dust storms, erosion, floods—, "fear like a poison in the veins," and withal a new moral and religious intensity "kicking like a mule." "The Candid Camera at Work": Much of the literature of the decade is a candid camera, factual reporting, and "area fiction." "Exploring the Inner World": Here we have the picture of a decade dealing with mumps and measles; the economic machine and earthquakes are not the whole picture; Freud and the inner life still have some importance despite Marx. "The Impact of the Depression": Of course; if men could not enjoy life, at least they could endure it. "Of Mortgages and Migrants": "Is it the death of the American earth?" "The Drama and Social Issues": The trend in the drama to wrestle with social problems is marked. "Social Poetry": Poetry, like the drama, comes to grips with social issues. Chapter X is "Religion—Implicit and Explicit": "If it were not for the generous profanity, we might wonder if God had ever been a subject of speculation by the human race, or if a man named Jesus had ever lived." What does this mean? Some writers are uninterested in religion, others take religion for granted. Some are ignorant, others are prejudiced. A few do speak out affirmatively. The final chapter, "War and Peace," is no inconsiderable theme as all know.

American Mirror is a good piece of work, revealing a broad knowledge and a keen insight.

W. R. MCNUTT

Modern Dictatorship, by Diana Spearman, New York, Columbia University Press, 1939, pp. 272, $2.75.

Here is an attempt to explain the rise of modern dictatorships. Mrs. Spearman looks upon them as essentially a revival of the older autocracies. The current social phenomena, she believes, contain at least two problems: "the problem essentially political, of the seizure of power, and the sociological problem of the change in public opinion which sanctioned its seizure."

While periods of crises produce dictatorships, these dictatorships are successful for various reasons, there being no one theory to account for their success, as a close analysis of the rise of the autocracies in Russia, Turkey, Italy, Poland, and Germany clearly demonstrates. In seeking to explain why these men were able to seize and maintain power, the author rejects such popular notions as the mass neurosis existing among the populace, the Marxian theory of the class struggle, and the like.

Once the state of political upheaval and economic distress reaches a certain point, powerful psychological factors enter into the picture. The longing for a leader and the "emotional satisfaction of hero worship" create a situation demanding a man of destiny. It is pointed out that the personalities of these dictators are of much the same type. The dictator is "supreme in his ability to wield power,

but also ruthless in the use of it." Mussolini, for example, said: "I am the Kemal Pasha of Italy, swift, strong, and relentless." The popular demand for this type of dictator can be explained by the fact that the great majority of the people have no outlets for its repressed desire for power. This repressed desire can be dealt with in two ways: "it can be turned into its opposite, a pleasure in submission to no power of others; or the desire for power can be gratified by identifying one's self with a powerful individual." The second of these alternatives is the line followed by more individuals, hence the sense of identification that people have with Der Führer and his success.

Mrs. Spearman is also on sound ground when she points out that the dictator takes something from religion. The cult of the ruler with all its symbolism is built up by traditionally emotional appeals which are quite religious in character. Moreover, an all-powerful ruler, "ready to reward and punish sin, is clearly a complete substitute for some types of religion." In the chapter, "Problems of an Autocratic Government," there is an excellent discussion of the relationship between a dictatorship and religion.

The book concludes with the observation that: "Democracy cannot compete with the dictators on their own ground. Democracy can offer neither the joys of obedience nor its rewards; neither 'the worship the heart lifts above and the heavens reject not,' an emotion eminently satisfying to certain people, nor the complete solution of every problem, personal or political. Democracy can only offer the responsibility of choosing for one's self. To those who shrink from that responsibility, democracy offers nothing. To those who accept it, it offers an opportunity for self-control, for sacrifice, for moderation."

While this contribution to an understanding of modern dictatorship is not profound, it is most readable, thoughtful, and objective.

RAY H. ABRAMS

Italy and the Vatican at War, by S. William Halperin, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939, pp. xvii, 483, $3.00.

The revolutionary period in Italy during which the temporal power of the papacy was challenged and lost is of particular interest to students of church history. In this significant study by Professor Halperin of the relations of Italy and the Vatican from the summer of 1870 until the death of Pope Pius IX in February, 1878, important details of that momentous period have been brought to light for the first time. Moreover, as a study in the relationship between religion and politics, it is exceedingly valuable.

Incidentally, certain parts of the book sound much like reprints of news and of the present world conflict: "On September 3 (1870) news of the overwhelming French defeat at Sedan reached Florence." When the Italian cabinet had decided that General Cadorna should cross the papal frontier on September 11 "an insurrection in Roman territory would have furnished an excellent pretext for invasion and the Florentine authorities had been waiting impatiently for just such an eventuality. But the failure of the pope's subjects to stage an uprising was deemed no deterrent to immediate military action." Then Cadorna was given detailed instructions: "He was to declare that the mission of his troops was purely 'conservative and protective.'" Thus many of the formulæ and methods of propagandists that are being used in "peaceful" conquests today were thought out and put into practice generations ago.

Professsor Halperin has done a thorough job in showing the immediate events that led up to the conquest of Rome, the reaction of the pope, the motives back of the voluntary imprisonment, the divided populace of Rome over acceptance of the new status of the pope. He goes into detail in explaining the attitude of foreign governments and their statesmen, such as Gladstone and Bismarck, concerning the *fait accompli.* The already complicated international scene was further disrupted by the papal claims to infallibility, etc., and the various loyalties and antipathies of groups within the various countries of Europe.

One of the most valuable contributions of this book is the intimate picture of old Pius IX—his dignity, sternness, and uncompromising attitude toward the reality of the unification of Italy and the loss of papal territory and temporal jurisdiction. He continued the feud relentlessly, and, as one writer has phrased it, his pontificate was "the most tempestuous in the entire history of the church." Yet when the Italian troops were launching an artillery attack on Rome, His Holiness calmly sat down at his writing-table and composed a charade on the word *tremare* (to tremble).

RAY H. ABRAMS

Can Religious Education Be Christian? Harrison S. Elliott, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. ix, 338, $2.50.

If, as orthodoxy insists, Christianity is a body of tradition and doctrine which we are under divine authority to transmit to the learner, then religious education cannot be Christian. Neither can any education be Christian, since transmission and authority are two concepts which are antithetical to the educative process. Both, together with any procedures based on them, preclude growth without which no education is taking place—so Dr. Elliott argues with verve and insight.

The authoritarian emphasis in Protestantism comes down to us from the Reformation period, and therein was laid the sanction for an educational procedure for imparting a saving truth. That idea has been the chief obstacle to vital education ever since. The Religious Education Movement a generation ago broke with that tradition, and despite certain overemphases here and there has brought to Protestantism a major contribution. Large sections of Protestantism are now committed to Christian education in full accord with the most trusted procedures in the world of general education.

Just when the old orthodoxy was being compelled to yield its dogmatic and authoritarian grounds, there arises a new orthodoxy, of the Barthian variety, to re-invigorate the old. Our author laments this and promptly challenges the neo-orthodoxy of Brunner, Homrighausen, and Edwin Lewis. All these have "a body of revelation" transcending human knowledge which must be transmitted *in toto,* regardless of human understanding. To combat the errors of neo-orthodoxy four chapters are written: "Human Knowledge," "The Human Predicament," "Sin and Guilt," and "Human Nature."

Having thus cleared the way of antagonistic and antithetical positions, Dr. Elliott proceeds to the constructive task of showing how religious education can become, and must become, genuinely Christian. Chapter headings will indicate the direction of his thought: "A Social Strategy," "Christlike Character," "Religious Experience," "Prayer and Worship," and "The Meaning of Christian Education."

W. R. MCNUTT

Christianity and Power Politics, by Reinhold Niebuhr, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940, pp. 226, $2.00.

This volume contains essays on various topics, some of which have been previously published in the United States or in Great Britain. Others appear here for the first time. The first one is entitled, "Why the Christian Church Is Not Pacifist." The second is on "The War and American Churches." The trenchant analysis which readers of Niebuhr have learned to expect is here and should be taken into account, even by those who may differ most radically from his point of view. Niebuhr asserts that some forms of pacifism tend to persuade men to refrain from all moral judgments or give preference to tyranny as over against anarchy. Resistance to evil force does not serve to set up the kingdom of God, but it may be a negative task which cannot be avoided. "Efforts to secure a hearing for refugees in our churches face the obstacle of fear that personal accounts of injustice might arouse the amiable and gentle souls of the parish to 'hatred.' Thus the Christian love commandment is equated with blindness to the tragic realities of a warring world. . . . . Any sympathy for victims of aggression, whether in Finland, Poland, or China, is decried as leading to American involvement. Any discriminate judgments between what is still decent in Europe and what is wholly evil and false is discouraged because this also might in the end involve us in war. . . . . It has become almost a universal dogma of American Christianity that any kind of peace is better than war. This always means in the end that tyranny is preferred to war." The final essay in this book is titled "The Christian Church in a Secular Age." It is the powerful address to which some of us listened in Oxford at the conference on the Life and Work of the Churches in the summer of 1937.

GORDON POTEAT

The Social Gospel Re-examined, by F. Ernest Johnson, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 261, $2.00.

The Rauschenbusch Lectures at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School in 1939 are now issued in book form, and this book has been chosen by the Religious Book Club as one of its monthly selections. The selection is an excellent one. Professor Johnson faces the criticism of the social gospel which today comes, not simply from religious and economic conservatives, but from theologians "who eschew biblical literalism" and who, in some cases at least, hold radical political and economic ideas. Niebuhr, Tillich, Brunner are names which appear frequently in his pages. The validity of much of this criticism is accepted, but it is argued that there is a danger that the neo-Calvinism of some of the critics may involve reactionary tendencies instead of progress to a higher and truer theological and ethical synthesis. "In a time of great social stress and disillusionment men turn almost instinctively away from the present, the tentative, the experimental . . . . and seek security in what is 'forever' established and therefore needs no validation in contemporary human experience. There is, I think, an obvious fallacy here," writes Professor Johnson, "in that their own experience is, after all, the most significant factor in their theological position." Liberal theology has emphasized the importance of experience in the interpretation of religion, and, whatever may be its deficiency along certain lines, this insight is permanently valid.

This is a very able discussion. It carries forward the present debate in theology and ethics to a higher level of comprehension and practicality. The

chapters on "The Nature of the Christian Ethic," "Our Secular Culture," "Christianity and War," and "Democracy and the Christian Ethic" are particularly notable.

GORDON POTEAT

Law and Love, by T. E. Jessop, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. 186, $2.25.

The professor of philosophy and psychology of the University College of Hull, England, has given us in this small volume a fresh approach to the study of the Christian ethic. It is often remarked that Christians do not live up to the precepts of Jesus. Professor Jessop argues that "it is our ideals, not our practice only, that are not yet Christian." Many good church people do not yet realize what it was that Jesus was driving at. "What I shall regard as deeply significant," writes Jessop, "is that what most moved Him to invective was not badness but goodness, not Herod and Barabbas but the Scribes and Pharisees . . . He was either rejecting goodness, or reinterpreting it very radically. . . . He was blowing sky-high those notions about morality which were as current in His day as they are in ours." It is refreshing to come across an author who has something important to say, who knows how to say it within the limits of brevity, who wastes no time threshing over old straw, who has no trace of conventionality or sentimentality in what he says about love. His closing paragraph is a quotation from Bertrand Russell which he introduces with these words: "When life comes to be dominated by it (Jesus' radical transformation of the idea of goodness) we shall have fulfilled the fine demand which a professed atheist has made for a religion really suited to the needs of men." If Russell had read this sort of book in his youth, his antipathy against Christianity, which he seems to have known only in its stodgy forms, might have been prevented. This is a "must" book for interpreters of the religion of Jesus.

GORDON POTEAT

Moral Leaders, by Edward Howard Griggs, New York, Abingdon Press, 1940, pp. 240, $2.00.

In this volume, the seventh series of lectures delivered at Drew University on the Drew Lectureship in Biography, we have an attempt to reveal how the moral leader serves mankind.

The function of a moral leader, it is contended, is fourfold. He is first of all a guide and inspirer of men, awakening within them the desire to seek or follow a higher way. In the next place, he is a mediator, in the sense that he brings "to birth the thoughts of others," giving expression to their inarticulate longings. Thirdly, he is one who assumes "the direct guidance of one's fellows in movements of constructive reform and sometimes of revolution." Finally, he is to stand out against the smug complacency of society, accepting the persecution which this inevitably involves.

Having stated these functions of the moral leader, Mr. Griggs then presents the life and work of six of them, seeking to interpret through them "the great epochs of culture, with our resulting heritage." From the ancient world Socrates is first considered. Then St. Francis of Assisi is dealt with as the fountainhead of the spiritual awakening of the Middle Ages. Next comes Erasmus the humanist. Thomas Carlyle, the man of letters who was also prophet and interpreter, is presented, with special attention to his philosophy of history. After Carlyle, his friend Emerson is introduced to us as a type of spiritual leadership in democracy.

The final study is of Tolstoy, the chapter title being, "Moral Leadership in Mysterious Russia."

One of the advantages of this book is its easy-flowing style. It is a delightful relaxation to read it. Though the work is not profound, and though the nature of the lectures precludes an exhaustive treatment of any one man, the book is well worth reading. I should recommend it strongly to laymen and ministers. The latter, I am sure, will find the book very stimulating homiletically.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

The Baptist Romance in the Heart of Europe, by Joseph Novotny, New York, John Felsberg, Inc., 1939, pp. 142, $0.75.

Beginnings are always interesting; they are inspiring, as in this case, when they have later fruition. The life story of Henry Novotny is intimately interwoven with the beginnings of Baptist witness among the Czechs, spiritual children of John Hus, among the Slovaks, dominantly Roman Catholic, and with the extension of that witness among Russians, dominantly Eastern Orthodox.

Henry Novotny was reared a Roman Catholic. At the age of twelve while he was at play in a deep forest one eye was injured. He was taken to a woodsman's cottage where he found himself in a secret prayer service of zealous Pismaks. For the first time he sensed the reality of prayer. This led to his conversion. He joined a Presbyterian church in Prague; studied theology in Switzerland and in Scotland where he was ordained a Congregational minister. Like Adoniram Judson, Bible reading convinced him that he had not been baptized according to the Scriptures. Seeking baptism he went to Lodz in Russian Poland, to the nearest group of Baptists. Returning to Prague he organized the First Baptist Church in 1885. The bitter persecution which followed only quickened his zeal. His witness first to the Czechs, then to the Slovaks, then to the Russians, has been caught up in the common witness of Baptists through the World Alliance.

The affection of his son Joseph who tells this remarkable story is held in restraint by the sober judgment of a trained mind.

CHARLES HATCH SEARS

New Poets from Old, by Henry W. Wells, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. x, 356, $3.50.

Modern poetry presents a fondness for psychological subleties and learned allusions. Our age, the possessor of a new and growing body of subject matter, writes its poetry with an amazing background of scientific, political, and philosophical developments. Yet the modern poet is not far from the past and expresses himself in a way that reveals his indebtedness to the heritages of technique, form, and spirit.

The conclusion—and the thesis—of this book is that each preceding age "has not only enriched our libraries with literature as durable as the language itself . . . . but is still a living influence" (p. 17). The author's aim is to show the conservative element in radical writers; to make modern poetry more significant to lovers of the older verse; to make the older verse more significant to lovers of modern poetry. "It is, to conclude, a study in literary genetics."

Thus far one is interested in the book, and the avowed aims of the author are realized fully. Yet the book goes farther and makes this relationship between the

past and the present one of conscious volition on the part of the modern poets. "A mere similarity between the work of a modern poet and that of a poet belonging to some earlier age warrants no mention here. It is not enough that the poet if confronted with a comparison should recognize it as sound. He must have recognized it already" (p. 24).

On this deliberate point the examples given are suggestive, but not conclusive. Conscious imitation is a difficult thing to determine. One must consider similarities of personal temperament, ability, and philosophy. There is, in addition, the sociological and intellectual biases of the poets. Finally, there is the age out of which a poet writes—itself a strong contributing factor to his poetry.

The book is an excellent and engaging study of the similarities that unite the present with the past and will convince the reader that poetry is a universal experience that has, after all, but few changes of garment in its public wardrobe.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

The Reverend Colonel Finch, by Elizabeth Nitchie, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. 109, $1.50.

Robert Finch, an Englishman who spent most of his mature life in Italy, wrote a letter to John Gisborne telling him of the last days of John Keats. Gisborne sent the letter to Shelley; and Mrs. Shelley, in turn, writing to Mrs. Gisborne, mentioned the letter and the writer, whom she disliked. Mrs. Shelley also knew a "Colonel Calicot Finch," whom Lord Byron called "the Reverend Colonel Finch." Miss Nitchie, acting upon a hint that the University of Oxford had been made the beneficiary of a man named Robert Finch in the early part of the nineteenth century, began to explore the Finch Collection in the Bodleian Library. This book presents her discovery that Robert Finch and Colonel Finch are the same man.

Apart from his one letter and a moderately fair collection of coins, Finch is not a notable figure of the period, in spite of the fact that he had such friends as Leigh Hunt and Joseph Severn and pretended to know well Byron, Coleridge, and the Shelleys. Very probably he did not know Keats at all. He was an eccentric character whose love of position and praise led him to adopt the title, "Colonel," and to ingratiate himself into the presence of the literary figures of his day.

Miss Nitchie has given one more new and fascinating biographical sidelight on the romantic movement in England.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

BOOK NOTICES

A Short History of Christianity, edited by Archibald G. Baker, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1940, pp. vii, 279, $2.00.

This is a timely, readable, and reliable history of the Christian movement from its rise to the present day. It is a good illustration of what a combination of "factual knowledge and intelligent interpretation" can do when faced with the task of condensing the record of a great religious movement, covering nearly twenty centuries, within the compass of a book of usual size.

Five other members of the faculty of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago collaborated with the editor in the production of the work, each covering the period of history in which he is a specialist.

For the convenience of study groups, each of the eight chapters is divided into four sections. The appended bibliography includes the titles of twenty-three works, only two of which were published prior to 1930.

This volume should have wide use among students who desire to gain a comprehensive view of the history of Christianity, and among general readers who wish to use the limited time at their disposal to the best advantage.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

Harper's Topical Concordance, by Charles R. Joy, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 478, $3.95.

This volume is a worthy successor to Hitchcock's *Analysis* and Nave's *Topical Bible.* It has all the virtues of these earlier works with the added value of having more texts, more conveniently arranged, under more topics.

Along with these values, there are some disadvantages. A book such as this may be a bonanza for lazy preachers. Here are Bible readings, prayer meeting talks, and sermon outlines at hand for the taking. This volume is intended to be an aid to the work of the biblical student, not a substitute for it. The reader may differ from the compiler, as when he finds Deut. 31 : 20, a passage referring to the Lord's people, listed under "Christ, Second Coming of." Or, he may feel sure that the compiler is in error, as when he discovers John 5 : 35, a word spoken by Jesus concerning John the Baptist, under the heading, "Christ, the Light." While such questions would come up infrequently, they illustrate the need of discrimination on the part of the reader. The minister will find this a very useful book.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

The Letters of Saint Boniface, translated with an Introduction by Ephraim Emerton, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. 204, $3.00.

These letters of one of the early and intrepid missionaries from England to the European continent reveal the expansion of Christian civilization in the region east of the Rhine in the eighth century. Winifred, or Boniface as he is better known, is remembered primarily as the "Apostle to the Germans." The reason for this title lies in his statesman-like work in aiding the conversion of the North German tribes

from paganism to Christianity. This activity, as well as valuable insights into the life of the Middle Ages, is disclosed in the course of the translated letters.

This volume will prove valuable to the student of church history and also to those who desire to establish the relationship between our own culture and that of the Middle Ages.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Adversity's Noblemen, by Charles Edward Trinkaus, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. 172, $2.00.

The Italian humanists of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries are not well known by the average American. In this volume Dr. Trinkaus introduces us to them, at the same time presenting their frequently diverse views on such problems as the true nature of man, whether or not his nature is well adapted to bringing him happiness, and whether the world, as constituted, is favorable or unfavorable to his well-being. Many different solutions to these basic problems are presented by the humanists, testifying at once to the fecundity of the human intellect and the varied reactions of people to the mystery of life.

The book is rather wearisome reading because of the multiplicity and the diversity of the views presented. It clearly discloses that there was no single philosophy of life among these humanists of Italy. Reading it tends to make one less dissatisfied with the variety of opinions and conclusions reached by our modern thinkers, especially the liberals among them.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Is God Emeritus? by Shailer Mathews, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. 93, $1.50.

Dr. Mathews answers his own question with an emphatic "No," but not until he has argued that many theologies are *emeritus.* Patterns of thought about God are erroneously identified with God himself, and where men reject the patterns they frequently conclude that they have rejected God also. "What faith can one hold when the God of outgrown patterns of thought no longer helps?" It is to answer this question that the argument of this book is directed. Those who are satisfied with the old formulæ will only be irritated with it, but ministers who are trying to mediate faith to persons whose education has been conditioned by a modern scientific world view will find the discussion very helpful.

GORDON POTEAT

The Individual and His Society, by Abram Kardiner, New York, Columbia University Press, 1939, pp. xxvi, 503, $3.50.

The subtitle of this book is *The Psychodynamics of Primitive Social Organization.* The methods of psychology and social anthropology are combined in an attempt to interpret the culture of the Marquesans, a Polynesian people of the South Pacific, and the Tanala of the island of Madagascar. The purpose of the study is the discovery of a method by which social change can be charted.

GORDON POTEAT

Christian Ethics in History and Modern Life, by A. G. Widgery, New York, Round Table Press, 1940, pp. ix, 318, $2.50.

Dr. Widgery is now professor of philosophy in Duke University. Formerly he was Stanton Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion in the University of Cambridge.

The first four chapters of this book sketch briefly the development of Christian ethical thinking in the church from the time of the gospels through the Protestant Reformation. Two chapters follow on "Christian Ethics and the Nature of Man" and "The Christian Doctrine of God and its Ethical Implications." Some criticisms of Christian ethics are considered in Chapter VII and some comparisons made with non-Christian systems in Chapter VIII. Then four chapters are given to discussion of the relation of Christian ethics to the family, politics, economics, and human culture. Very full bibliographical notes are given in an appendix. This book is not a fresh and original discussion of Christian ethics, but rather a reading book in this field. It is loaded down with quotations from a multitude of authors and, in form, seems to be much like a professor's classroom notes. If one hasn't time to read sources it will service as a fairly complete survey of the field. GORDON POTEAT

A Faith to Affirm, by James Gordon Gilkey, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. xi, 170, $1.75.

The faith affirmed by Dr. Gilkey, minister of the South Congregational Church, Springfield, Mass., is the faith of a thoroughgoing liberal. He eschews all "supernatural" phases of Christianity and proceeds, from that position, to think through many matters of vital interest to those liberated from the slavery of the closed mind. His volume will be blessed by an increasing host of people who have forsaken the old but have not found solid ground in the new. If one asks, Just what kind of Christianity can live in this present, scientifically conceived universe? this book will help give the answer. Note the table of contents: "Our New Picture of Jesus," "Our New Interpretation of the Christian Message," "How Can We Discover What Is Right?" "Four Perennial Questions about Sin and Sinners," "Does God Intervene in Human Affairs?" "Our New Understanding of God's Care," "Living One's Daily Life with God," "In Place of Heaven and Hell," "A Modern Christian's Secret of Serenity," "The Social Problem of Liberal Protestantism," and "Leading Our Children into the World of Religion."

Dr. Gilkey thinks clearly and writes pungently; read him. W. R. MCNUTT

Not Alone, by Joseph R. Sizoo, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. 99, $1.25.

The author is minister of the Collegiate Church of St. Nicholas, New York City, and one of the challenging voices of the contemporary American pulpit. His volume is composed of thirteen sermons or religious essays devoted to timely interpretations of certain phases of the present religious scene. Sample topics are "We Are Not Alone," "The Adventure of Faith," "The Need for Reality," "The Weakness of Strength," "To Thine Own Self Be True," "Building on Risks," and "Hope of the World." Each is fascinatingly done, and will reward the reader even though he may not always be in full agreement, as this reviewer is not, for example, in Essay XI, "The Meaning of Religion," wherein the author sees Christianity as wholly revelation and in no degree discovery. W. R. MCNUTT

Theory and Practice of Social Case Work, by Gordon Hamilton, New York, Columbia University Press, pp. viii, 388, $3.00.

Social case work has become a highly specialized profession. Efficient workers in this field are trained in the practical application of the sciences of both sociology

and psychology. Once it might have been said that the case worker's equipment was "common sense," but not so today; the demand now is common sense thoroughly educated in relation to a definite professional challenge.

The present volume is devoted to a full restatement of the theory of case work and to its more practical phases and applications. Such a book is invaluable to the case worker, and will prove most suggestive to the pastoral ministry.

W. R. MCNUTT

At Jesus Feet, edited by Edward W. Schramm, 2nd rev. ed., Columbus, Lutheran Book Concern, 1940, pp. 748, $1.50.

This is a book of daily devotions for use in the family, particularly where children are members of the circle. The author writes beautifully, simply, and with "understanding heart." Since his approach is devotional, naturally the book is not critical in any sense. The entire volume is a fine example of how to use the Scriptures constructively and as food for religious life. Those who wish to preach sermonettes to children or tell them Bible stories will also find *At Jesus Feet* both an inspiration and a treasury of riches. On every page is literary excellence and religious beauty.

The reviewer wishes the author had not taken angels and miracles for granted. Children should not be laden with that which they must discard as adults. Fortunately he does spare "these little ones" from demons and devils; for that we are grateful. We ought to cease teaching the untruths of a prescientific age.

W. R. MCNUTT

The Messianic Hope of Israel, by Max I. Reich, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1940, pp. 133, $1.00.

This is a simple book, with a single message, *viz.,* that the Old Testament enshrines a progressive revelation of a wonderful hope (p. 14). By devious methods the author thinks he has extracted from various parts of the Old Testament history and literature that which he desired—proof of the Messiahship of Jesus. The ingenuity here displayed can prove anything; hence proves nothing.

I. G. MATTHEWS

Religion or Superstition—Which? by Robert J. Cole, Boston, Chapman & Grimes, 1939, pp. 55, $1.00.

The theme of the book is interesting. Certainly there are superstitions in the Old and the New Testaments, and more than those of which the author seems conscious. Indeed, he himself is the victim of superstitions that for long centuries have been perpetuated by the Christian church, *e. g.,* complete indifference to the context and the historical background, and the assumption of the validity of the King James translation. Yet he is alert to some of the primitive holdovers of Scripture. But on the whole, the lack of organization and the evident cynicism, together with the apparent ignorance of the author, make the volume of little or no value.

I. G. MATTHEWS

The March of Medicine, edited by the Committee on Lectures to the Laity of the New York Academy of Medicine, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. x, 168, $2.00.

Six chapters, by as many different authors, tell the story of medicine through the ages. The themes are: "From Folkways to Modern Medicine," "Health in Elizabethan England," "Not So Long Ago" (the story of American life at the beginning of the nineteenth century), "The Romance of Modern Surgery," "The Story of Insanity," and "The Cinderella of Medicine" (Psychiatry).

These lectures bring out the highlights of medical progress. The lecturers have told a scientific story in a way that makes most interesting reading for the layman. Medicine and religion are blood-brothers and the later developments of the healing art are especially good material for the modern minister's pastoral background.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Tom Taylor and the Victorian Drama, by Winton Tolles, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. vii, 299, $3.50.

In 1863 a play, "The Ticket of Leave Man," opened in London and gave to succeeding generations the name of one of its characters by which to call all melodramatic detectives—"Hawkshaw." Two years later Abraham Lincoln was assassinated at Ford's Theatre in Washington while attending a performance of "Our American Cousin." Both plays were written by Tom Taylor, perhaps the most important English dramatist between the years 1840 and 1880.

The period during which Taylor wrote for the stage witnessed a change in the status and character of the English theatre. It began in a state of confusion about styles of drama and a general agreement between the better people and the Church that the theatre was an immoral and undesirable institution. It ended with a definite sense of direction and preparedness for the newer forms of the drama that were to appear. It had acquired the dignity of popular approval when the public followed the lead of their queen, who openly attended plays. No other period in English dramatic history has experienced so many dramatic developments.

In this change Tom Taylor had a very definite part. His work bridged the two eras. Indeed, most of the important changes in the drama can be traced to his work. As a leading and accepted dramatist he had an excellent opportunity to advance the character of the drama even further. Unfortunately, he was not quite equal to the task. He opened the door to Shaw, Pinero, and others, but could not enter himself.

Because the plays of this period seem to have been written with a view of the type of drama required by London theatres and in the manner of Victorian audience-approval, this volume is indirectly a social study. To many it will have the weakness of most books of its kind: too much attention is given to detailed synopses of the plays discussed.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

BOOKS RECEIVED

Southern Baptist Handbook, 1940, by E. P. Alldredge, Nashville, Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1940, pp. 478, $1.00.

Statistics of Jews and Jewish Organizations, by H. S. Linfield, New York, American Jewish Committee, 1939, pp. 64, no price.

An historical review of the censuses, 1850–1937.

Bible Study: The Gospel According to Luke, by G. Gast, Columbus, Lutheran Book Concern, 1940, pp. 190, $0.35.

It would not appear that students need fear heresy in this little volume.

Bypaths in the Greek New Testament, by Kenneth S. Wuest, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1940, pp. 127, $1.00.

A volume for English readers by a teacher at the Moody Bible Institute.

Oil for the Lamps of Christians, by C. Gordon Brownville, Philadelphia, Judson Press, 1940, pp. 122, $1.00.

Five devotional studies delivered before the Northern Baptist Convention at Atlantic City in May, 1940.

Vital American Beliefs, by Sumner Harwood, Cambridge (Mass.), Cambridge Analytical Service, 1940, pp. 44, $0.25.

Little Bits about Big Men, by B. C. Forbes, New York, B. C. Forbes Publishing Company, 1940, pp. 223, $2.50.

A collection of anecdotes and squibs about hundreds of folk in the popular eye. Many of them are humorous; all are interesting. To many congregations it might prove a welcome substitute for *Two Thousand Sacred Thoughts for Tired Preachers.*

The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries, by William Bell Dinsmore, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. 274, $4.50.

This is one of the major contributions to the study of a classical problem which combines the difficulty of assembling a jigsaw puzzle of which half the pieces are missing with the pleasant hope that when next the maid sweeps the house a few more of the pieces will be found.

Emilie Durkheim and His Sociology, by Harry Alpert, New York, Columbia University Press, 1939, pp. 233, $2.75.

This is the first full study of the work of Durkheim, the French sociologist, to appear in English since his death in 1917. The first section is biographical; the second and the third sections deal with his sociological conceptions.

Evolution of Wisdom: A Study of the Church, by Frank S. Gordon, Blairstown, N. J., Blairstown Press, 1940, pp. 50, $0.35.

A Laymen's Guide to Churchmanship, by Ira Abbott Morton, Denver, Criterion Press, Inc., 1940, pp. 21, $0.25.

What Is Christianity? by C. C. Morrison, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1940, pp. 324, $3.00.

Reviewed in this issue, pp. 14-22.

**An Introduction to Philo Judæus,* by Erwin R. Goodenough, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1940, pp. 223, $2.75.

**French Pioneers in the West Indies, 1624–1664,* by N. M. Crouse, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. 294, $3.50.

**Anno Domini,* by K. S. Latourette, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. xv, 248, $2.50.

**The Creed of Christ,* by Gerald Heard, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 169, $2.00.

**Into Abundance,* by Soren K. Ostergaard, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1940, pp. x, 154, $1.50.

For Conscience' Sake—A Study of Mennonite Migrations Resulting from the World War, by Sanford Calvin Yoder, Gorham (Ind.), Mennonite Hist. Soc., 1940, pp. xx, 300, no price.

**The World's Need of Christ,* New York and Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1940, pp. 237, $2.00.

**The Springs of Creative Living,* by Rollo May, New York and Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1940, pp. 271, $2.00.

Christmas Treasures, by J. H. Gwynne, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1940, pp. 160, $1.00.

**The Four Pillars of Democracy,* by E. J. Goodspeed, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 148, $1.75.

**Chart for Happiness,* by Hornell Hart, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. xi, 198, $2.50.

**From the Stone Age to Christianity,* by W. F. Albright, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1940, pp. xi, 363, $2.50.

**The World's Need of Christ,* by Charles A. Ellwood, New York and Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1940, pp. 237, $2.00.

The Catholic Church in Indiana, 1789–1834, by Thomas T. McAvoy, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. 226, $2.25.

**Liberal Education in a Democracy,* by Stewart G. Cole, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. viii, 309, $3.00.

**Introduction to Youth,* by Erdman Harris, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. xii, 221, $1.75.

The New Testament According to the Eastern Text, translated by George M. Lamsa, Philadelphia, A. J. Holman, 1940, pp. xxvi, 527, $3.00.

Lamsa's work on the "original Aramaic" documents needs no comment.

God Save the Home, by W. E. Schuette, Columbus, Lutheran Book Concern, 1940, pp. 72, $0.60.

To Live Is Christ, by Emil W. Matzner, Columbus, Lutheran Book Concern, 1940, pp. 430, $2.50.

A volume of sermons.

**Let the Church Be the Church,* by E. G. Homrighausen, New York and Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1940, pp. 199, $2.00.

**The Problem of Religious Knowledge,* by D. C. Macintosh, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 390, $3.50.

**The Two Humanities,* by D. R. Davies, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 256, $2.50.

**Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York, 1711–1775,* by Irving Mark, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. 237, $3.00.

**A Philosophy of Christian Revelation,* by Edwin Lewis, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 356, $3.00.

**What We Mean by Religion,* by W. L. Sperry, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 177, $1.75.

**Glimpses of Mennonite History,* by J. C. Wenger, Scottdale (Penna.), Mennonite Publishing House, 1940, pp. xii, 126, $0.75.

**Scholasticism and Politics,* by Jacques Maritain, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. 248, $2.50.

**The Sermon on the Mount,* by Martin Dibelius, New York, Scribner, 1940, pp. 147, $1.50.

**The Elizabethan Sermon,* by Alan F. Herr, Philadelphia, privately printed, 1940, pp. 169, no price.

**Jesus Christ the Same,* by James Moffatt, New York and Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1940, pp. 223, $2.00.

**Christianity: An Inquiry into Its Nature and Truth,* by H. F. Rall, New York, Scribner, 1940, pp. xi, 363, $2.50.

**Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work,* edited by Grace L. Coyle, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. xi, 736, $3.00.

Community and Worship, by D. V. Steere, Wallingford (Penna.), Pendle Hill, 1940, pp. 34, $0.10.

The Voice of Books, by J. V. Moldenhawer, New York and Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1940, pp. 174, $1.75.

How Came the Bible, by E. J. Goodspeed, New York and Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1940, pp. 148, $1.50.

A series of thirteen lessons on the formation, transmission, and translation of the Bible, which appeared in the autumn issues of *The Adult Bible Class Monthly* under the caption, "The Growth of the Bible."

**The Ephesian Tradition,* by H. E. Dana, Kansas City, Kansas City Seminary Press, 1940, pp. 175, $1.00.

* To be reviewed.